

# THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXXIII.]

MARCH, 1860.

[VOL. XVI.]

THEODORE PARKER.\*

THE sudden retirement of this brave man and diligent student, owing to serious disease of the lungs, would be a fit occasion for reviewing his public life, even if he had not invited such review by his autobiographical letter to his late congregation. While we cordially express our deep admiration of his character and acts just where action is especially the test of American character, and have also, we trust, a true appreciation of him beyond our agreement with his opinions, we must not hesitate to speak plainly on what seems to us his very equivocal position towards Christianity and the Christian church. This is our plain duty (just now especially) as Unitarian Christians, who adhere to the belief of a supernatural revelation of the Divine Will, and who cannot reconcile with this belief a philosophy which insists that miracle and inspiration are impossible, or (which comes, we think, to the same thing) that they belong to all ages and places alike.

The true glory of Theodore Parker consists in the fearless opposition which he has made to Slavery, against which he tells us he has "spoken more than any concrete wrong, because it is the greatest of all, 'the sum of all villanies,' and the most popular, the wanton darling of the government." His practical defiance of the Fugitive Slave Bill was a matter of course with such a man; and he recalls that exciting time with evident pride in his letter to his flock: "Then I preached against slavery as never before, and defied the impudent statute, whereto you happily said *Amen* by the first clapping of hands which for years had welcomed a sermon in Boston; how could you help the natural indecorum?" (p. 94). He soon brought upon himself a state prosecution by "gibbeting the wrong before the eyes of the people," by "preaching against the jackals of slavery," and (if we remember rightly) by harbouring fugitives in his own house. And then he made the preliminary stages of the prosecution too hot with righteous indignation for American justice to venture upon bringing him to trial. Honour to Theodore

---

\* Theodore Parker's Experience as a Minister, with some Account of his Early Life and Education for the Ministry; contained in a Letter from him to the Members of the Twenty-eighth Congregational Society of Boston. Pp. 128. London—E. T. Whitfield. 1859.

Parker for so using his giant strength! It is not every man, with the same deep and resolute sense of right, that *could* do precisely this. Few have the same personal prowess, the same dauntless bearing, the same iron nerve, the same combative power, or the same popular speech. William Ellery Channing, whose bravery in writing as he did on Slavery and on the Texas Annexation has not been surpassed even by Parker, would certainly never have flinched before the public prosecutor; but he could not perhaps have frightened the latter away before the trial was to come on. Nor perhaps would he have brandished with grand and scornful defiance the trenchant speech which *was to have been spoken*, when occasion for speaking it had so satisfactorily failed him. But Parker

“Fought all the battle o’er again;  
And thrice he routed all his foes,  
And thrice he slew his slain.”

It was one of the finest passages that has yet occurred in the Anti-slavery struggle. Theodore Parker was doubly in his element, rejoicing in the excitement of conflict, and feeling that he was fighting for the cause of humanity. He declares, indeed, in his letter to his friends at Boston, that he does not love conflict: “I may as well confess it, after all, I am not much of a fighter; my affections are developed far better than my intellect. It may be news to the public; to you it is but too well known” (p. 105). Nevertheless, we of the public (to whom this is indeed news) involuntarily derive from his own writings the constant impression that his intellect is very prominently developed in the direction of strong dogmatic thought, love of argument and controversy; and we perpetually feel in reading him that, with all his intrinsic nobleness and generosity, and possibly tenderness of feeling, he pursues his metaphysical and theological speculations with a most rude disregard to the convictions, and still more to the religious feelings and sentiments, of persons as earnestly religious as himself; whom he “gibbets” almost as relentlessly for what he thinks their backward theology, as he does his pro-slavery opponents for their backward morals and humanity. But in the affair of the Fugitive Slave Bill, where the most palpable wrongs were to be resisted and redressed, his deep sense of justice and right was not less evident than his controversial prowess; and in no passage of his life were the two great elements of his mind and character jointly roused to such intense and noble action. Theodore Parker was truly great on that occasion. Perhaps a gentler spirit could not have done his work. He has been compared to Luther for the combination of strong affections with intellectual power and moral bravery in conflict. The two men were, we believe, not unlike in power and bravery. And the only misapplication of the parallel is,



when it is applied beyond the work of the anti-slavery man to that of the theologian.

As a diligent student and comprehensive, if not always careful or minute scholar, Theodore Parker must ever command our admiration. It is rarely found that so much reading can be combined with such activity in social and political life. He possesses, beyond a doubt, great natural gifts of apprehension and memory; and it is plain that the comparative leisure of his early ministerial life at Roxbury was most diligently devoted to the study of books. His translation of De Wette's *Introduction to the Old Testament*, and his additions to it, are proof of his large and varied learning, whatever we may think of some of his critical conclusions.

We turn now to his theology and philosophy. The two are indeed one and the same. In his "Experience" he repeats in summary what he has developed at large in his various publications, and most methodically in his *Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion*. We shall briefly state in his own words his theory of religion; and we must calmly inquire what is its true position as regards Christianity.

Mr. Parker thus describes what he calls *the Absolute Religion*:

"I found certain great primal Intuitions of Human Nature, which depend on no logical process of demonstration, but are rather facts of consciousness given by the instinctive action of human nature itself. I will mention only the three most important which pertain to Religion.

"1. The Instinctive Intuition of the Divine, the consciousness that there is a God.

"2. The Instinctive Intuition of the Just and Right, a consciousness that there is a Moral Law, independent of our will, which we ought to keep.

"3. The Instinctive Intuition of the Immortal, a consciousness that the Essential Element of man, the principle of Individuality, never dies.

"Here, then, was the foundation of Religion, laid in human nature itself, which neither the atheist nor the more pernicious bigot, with their sophisms of denial or affirmation, could move or even shake. I had gone through the great spiritual trial of my life, telling no one of its hopes or fears, and I thought it a triumph that I had psychologically established these three things to my own satisfaction, and devised a scheme which to the scholar's mind, I thought, could legitimate what was spontaneously given to all by the great primal Instincts of Mankind."—Pp. 15, 16.

Again, he says:

"For these three great doctrines—of God, of Man, of Religion—I have depended on no Church and no Scripture; yet have I found things to serve me in all Scriptures and every Church. I have sought my authority in the Nature of Man—in facts of consciousness within me, and facts of observation in the human world without. To me the Material World and the outward History of man do not supply a sufficient revelation of God, nor warrant me to speak of Infinite Perfection.

It is only from the Nature of Man, from facts of intuition, that I can gather this greatest of all truths, as I find it in my consciousness reflected back from Deity itself.

"I know well what may be said of the 'Feebleness of all the Human Faculties,' their 'unfaithfulness and unfitness for their work;' that the mind is not adequate for man's intellectual function, nor the conscience for the moral, nor the affections for the philanthropic, nor the soul for the religious, nor even the body for the corporeal, but that each requires miraculous help from a God who is only outside of Humanity! There is a denial which boldly rejects the Immortality of Man and the existence of Deity, with many another doctrine dear and precious to mankind: but the most dangerous scepticism is that which, professing allegiance to all these, and crossing itself at the name of Jesus, is yet so false to the great Primeval Instinct of Man, that it declares he cannot be certain of anything he learns by the normal exercise of any faculty! I have carefully studied this School of Doubt, modern, not less than old, as it appears in history. In it there are honest inquirers after truth, but misled by some accident; and also sophists, who live by their sleight of mind, as jugglers by their dexterity of hand. But the chief members of this body are the Mockers, who, in a world they make empty, find the most fitting echo to their hideous laugh; and Churchmen of all denominations, who are so anxious to support their ecclesiastic theology, that they think it is not safe on its throne till they have annihilated the claim of Reason, Conscience, the Affections, and the Soul to any voice in determining the greatest concerns of man—thinking there is no place for the Christian Church or the Bible till they have nullified the faculties which have created both, and rendered Bible-makers and Church-founders impossible. But it is rather a poor compliment these ecclesiastic sceptics pay their Deity to say He so makes and manages the world that we cannot trust the sights we see, the sounds we hear, the thoughts we think, or the moral, affectional, religious emotions we feel; that we are certain neither of the intuitions of instinct, nor the demonstrations of reason, but yet by some anonymous testimony can be made sure that Balaam's she-ass spoke certain Hebrew words, and one undivided third part of God was 'born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, descended into Hell, and the third day rose again,' to take away the wrath which the other two undivided third parts of God felt against all mankind!"—Pp. 51—53.

These two quotations will together sufficiently explain both Mr. Parker's own views and also his habitual mode of speaking of Christianity and Christians and the Scriptures. By way of clearing the ground from secondary questions, we observe first on the latter. It seems to us strange, and very far from right, that Mr. Parker, who was educated among Unitarians, who knows their views, and speaks not unfrequently with a certain respect for them and their theological position as distinguished from Calvinism, Trinitarianism and Bibliolatry, should habitually neglect this distinction when he is advocating his own Absolute Religion as opposed to Christianity. The second extract above given is a sample of this continually repeated injus-



tice, mixed with its usual coarseness. The alternative is falsely represented as lying between what he calls the "Absolute Religion" and that dull orthodox bibliolatry which receives the Church Prayer-book also as infallible, and which does not need Parker's sledge-hammer to smash to pieces, as it has long since undergone the more discriminating application of biblical criticism and exegetics. This mode of representing the question is not fair, except on the part of one who (as we are inclined to believe was the case with Thomas Paine) *honestly but ignorantly* identifies the religion of the Scriptures with that of the least enlightened sects or individual Christians. The description (in the last paragraph of the second extract) of "what may be said" by those who do depend on Scripture (if not rather on church), is a gross burlesque upon what even the more reasonable of the orthodox would say, as it mixes up follies of biblical interpretation and the extra-biblical doctrine of the Trinity in one confused mass, and represents the belief in every absurd and untenable principle of reasoning, as well as absurd interpretation of Scripture, as the alternative for those who do not accept the "Absolute Religion." This, we repeat, might be fair in Tom Paine, who knew no better; but is not fair in Theodore Parker, who knows better.

Mr. Parker's estimate of the Scriptures is either very complex or very inconsistent. He seems to take delight in disparaging them by the gross over-statement of critical facts which are true to a certain degree in the knowledge of every scholar, and also by gratuitous slurs thrown on them in passing; yet every now and then he speaks of them with seeming reverence. The Bible is with him "a collection of quite heterogeneous books, most of them anonymous, or bearing names of doubtful authors, collected none knows how, or when, or by whom; united more by caprice than any philosophic or historic method" (p. 12). The Old Testament is, again (p. 31), "an anonymous Hebrew book;" and the New Testament, "an anonymous Greek book," teaching "that man is born totally depraved, and God will perpetually slaughter men in hell by the million, though they had committed no fault, except that of not believing an absurd doctrine they had never heard of." This we call too bad. It is a mere *argumentum ad Calvinum*. It is simply false respecting the Bible, though true of certain unscriptural creeds. Christianity is (p. 50) one of "the six great historic forms of religion—the Brahmanic, Hebrew, Classic, Buddhistic, Christian, Mohammedan;" and of all the six alike it is said, that "spite of the excellence which they contain, and the vast service the humblest of them has done, yet each must ere long prove a hindrance to human welfare." In his *Discourse of Religion*, Abraham is "a mythological character of some excellence," and Moses "another and greater mythological hero" (p. 164). Throughout his Discourses

he constantly speaks of Jesus Christ in such a way as pointedly to preclude the miraculous, by coupling him with others besides the greatest of great men. Yet, on the other hand, he says, "The critical study of the Bible only enhanced my reverence for the great and good things I found in the Old Testament and New;" and, "To me the name of Christianity is most exceeding dear, significant of so great a man and of such natural emotions, ideas and actions, as are of priceless value to mankind." But Parker makes it perfectly clear, at all events, that he ascribes nothing miraculous or inspired to the contents of the Bible:

"I have taken exquisite delight in the grand words of the Bible, putting it before all other sacred literature of the whole ancient world: to me it is more dear when I regard them not as the miracles of God, but as the work of earnest men, who did their uttermost with holy heart. I love to read the great Truths of Religion set forth in the magnificent poetry of Psalmist and Prophet, and the humane lessons of the Hebrew peasant, who summed up the Prophets and the Law in one word of LOVE, and set forth man's daily duties in such true and simple speech! As a Master, the Bible were a tyrant; as a Help, I have not time to tell its worth; nor has a sick man speech for that, nor need I now, for my public and private teachings sufficiently abound in such attempts. But yet to me the great men of the Bible are worth more than all their words; he that was greater than the Temple, whose soul burst out its walls, is also greater than the Testament, but yet no Master over you or me, however humble men!"—Pp. 99, 100.

He says expressly (p. 101), "I have departed from the fundamental principle of the Catholics and the Protestants, *denied the fact of a miraculous revelation*, given exclusively to Jews and Christians, *denied the claim to supernatural authority*, and utterly broken with that vicariousness which puts an alleged revelation in place of common sense, and the blood of a crucified Jew instead of excellence of character." (Again a passage worthy of Tom Paine, confounding the Scriptures with the creed-books.) Parker goes on, however, in the next sentences, to claim a *divine mission* for himself:

"In the least historic of the New Testament Gospels it is related that Jesus miraculously removed the congenital blindness of an adult man, and because he made known the fact that his eyes were thus opened, and told the cause, the Pharisees cast him out of their synagogue. What this mythic story relates as an exceptional measure of the Pharisees, seems to have founded a Universal Principle of the Christian Church, which cannot bear the presence of a man who, *divinely sent*, has washed in the pool of Siloam, and returned seeing and telling why."—P. 102.

He records his early conviction "that no part of the Old Testament or New could be called the 'Word of God,' save in the sense that all truth is God's word." And he speaks of his subsequent attainment of "that philosophical idea of God which



*makes a theological miracle as impossible as a round triangle, or any other self-evident contradiction"* (p. 10).

There should be no mistake, after reading such statements, in assigning Mr. Parker's theological position. He is a pure Theist, a disciple of the religion of Nature, and a denier of the possibility of any other religion. He is one of whom the disciples of Natural Religion may well be proud. We do not call him Theist in disparagement. Of course we do not think the less highly of him for his sincere convictions. It ought to be unnecessary to say this, though unbelief is so often regarded as irreligion. But the religion of Nature, as Parker holds it, is a noble religion. We gratefully accept and study its ever open book. We may doubt perhaps whether Theodore Parker has found in it all that he thinks he has. We may think he is more indebted indirectly to the miraculous and inspired in Christianity than he will allow. It is easy to find a star in the heavens when we have been shewn it first. But we take him on his own grounds and say that his Natural Religion is pure and noble. Our only possible disapproval of such a man in connection with his religious views, must be if he does not manfully, devoutly and consistently sustain the position which he has theoretically adopted. We therefore cannot understand why Mr. Parker should claim the name of Christianity as "most exceeding dear," any more than that of any other of the six religions. Nor can we see why he should have felt hurt at ceasing to find himself acceptable in avowedly Christian pulpits; or have expected Unitarian ministers always to attend his public lectures; or have regarded it as an "ecclesiastical, academical and personal insult" that the theological professors of the Cambridge Divinity School should have declined indorsing the invitation given by four of their pupils to Mr. Parker to deliver the customary address to them the Sunday before their graduation. Does any Unitarian minister think himself persecuted or insulted because his Independent or Baptist Trinitarian neighbour never asks him to exchange pulpits or preach his charity sermon? Does he expect all the Dissenting ministers to attend his lecture at a Mechanics' Institute? Would the theological faculty of the Independent College, St. John's Wood, have been considered guilty of "the greatest ecclesiastical, academical and personal insult in their professional power" to offer, if some of their young students had wished to be addressed by a Unitarian minister, and the request had been refused by the College authorities? We confess our surprise that Theodore Parker should querulously complain of these things, instead of taking his own position manfully. We do not of course undertake to vindicate all that he quotes as having been said of him and against him even by Unitarians; but we can no more vindicate what he has said of them (for certainly the hard and bitter sayings are not all on one side); and we think that if Mr. Parker, instead of

trying to insist upon Christian recognition while expressly denying a miraculous Christianity, had visibly acted out his own theology by proclaiming the Church of the Absolute Religion, not many hard things would or could have been said of him by Unitarians at least, who, generally speaking, do respect sincerity and consistency in every man, whether he believe more or less than themselves, or in whatever way he believe differently from them. But Parker has no patience with his best friends, because they do not all give up, at his call, the historical claims of miraculously revealed religion, to accept with him the *absolute*. He pities "the little Unitarian bark," which (as he thinks) "after many a venturous and profitable cruise, while in sight of port, the winds all fair, o'ermastered by its doubts and fears, reverses its course, and sails into dark, stormy seas, where no such craft can live" (p. 71). He sneers at the "liberal Christians," the "party of progress." He reproaches them for "their inconsistent and traditionary talk about 'Atonement,' 'Redeemer,' 'Salvation by Christ,' and their frequent resort to other pieces of damaged phraseology" (p. 68). The once "free and young and growing party (he says) became a sect, hide-bound, bridled with its creed, harnessed to an old, lumbering and crazy chariot, urged with sharp goads by near-sighted drivers, along the dusty and broken pavement of tradition, noisy and shouting, but going nowhere" (p. 68). He rebukes the Unitarians for lack of piety as well as lack of philosophy; and hard, rude vulgar words such as we have quoted fall from his pen continually respecting those of whom he yet says: "I count it a great good fortune that I was bred among religious Unitarians, and thereby escaped so much superstition." It seems quite absurd for such a man to sentimentalize on the hardship of exclusion from community of religious feeling with his quondam religious denomination, when his own convictions remove him quite as far from the power of sympathizing with the movements of their despised chariot or bark, as his departure removes his course from their theological co-operation. This whimpering after the theological sympathy of those towards whose theology he feels nothing but contemptuous pity, is almost beyond our power to realize, quite beyond our power to explain. Are we to take this as a proof that he is not much of a fighter after all, but a man of affection? No doubt affection has its vagaries, and it is at any rate "well dissembled" when the lover "kicks his beloved down stairs." But the sentimentality of early religious association ought not, at all events, to overcome the duty owing to truth. And no man, to all appearance, is more capable of self-reliance than Theodore Parker. It would be incomparably easier for him consistently to take his stand upon the Absolute Religion, than it was for Lindsey to renounce his Church and clerical sympathies. Nor can we imagine any explanation of his hurt feelings after shutting himself



out of the Unitarian Christian church, which would not vindicate F. D. Maurice, Jowett and many other unbelieving clergymen of the Church of England, in staying in that Church, notwithstanding all their doubts and denials of its doctrine. The true morality of belief is, to act out its convictions and take its natural consequences; and it seems to us a matter of simple necessity, and not a visitation of moral pains and penalties upon diversity of belief, that when Mr. Parker ceased to hold the central religious convictions and resulting feelings which once bound him to the Unitarian church and its ministers, the religious sympathy between him and them was modified accordingly. He records as an exceptional fact that his friendship with the Rev. James Freeman Clarke is unbroken, though their religious views widely differ; and we see no reason so likely to explain the implied rupture of a good many other friendships as the strong and rough speech in which Mr. P. himself indulges. But illness has already softened some of those asperities on both hands; and let us trust it will have more and more this effect, and that Theodore Parker may live to resume his work manfully among those who think and believe with him, while peacefully and gently towards those whom they think laggards in religious philosophy.

We have given our best attention, not now only, but on the appearance of Parker's *Discourse of Religion* many years ago, to his theory of the *Absolute Religion*, in the earnest desire of correctly appreciating his theological position. It is perfectly plain, from what has been already quoted, that he rejects altogether, as philosophically impossible, the idea of a supernatural or miraculous revelation, or of any inspiration except that which belongs to all men in all ages as an attribute of their nature. It is perfectly clear, too, that his own belief is a high and elevated one on the three great points enumerated in our first extract, namely, the infinite perfection of God, the moral faculty of man, and his immortality. These constitute with him the Absolute Religion, independent of all scriptures and creeds. On all these points he holds the most full and undoubting belief that even a Christian could express. The questions for him to settle with his readers are, *How this Absolute Religion is gained?* and *how it is proved?* And if we understand him rightly, the two questions have one answer: The Absolute Religion is instinctive, and therefore wants no proof. "It is the normal development, use, discipline and enjoyment of every part of the body and every faculty of the spirit; the direction of all natural powers to their natural purposes." It "begins in the instinctive feelings, and thence advances to reflective ideas, and assumes its ultimate form in the character of men, and so appears in their actions" (p. 50). It is called *Absolute* or *Natural* as if synonymously. Now if its advocate were content to say that man has by nature a faculty or sense of worship, a moral sense or conscience, and a faculty that

imagines and desires immortality, few persons perhaps would deny that these are essential parts of the human constitution. It might be more open to dispute whether these faculties should be described as having "*instinctive intuitions*" of God and Right and Immortality. The *faculty* may belong intrinsically to our nature, yet its *convictions* may not be intuitive or instinctive. We thankfully recognize the religious faculty, in its three aspects, as belonging to the very nature of man, and being therefore the basis of Natural Religion in all its varieties. But that this faculty *instinctively* or *intuitively* gains the three religious beliefs above named, we very much doubt. When we see with what variety the sense of God, of conscience and of immortality, is held by various nations and individuals, we are disposed to regard these varieties as referable rather to physical and social causes, than as consistent with the proper idea of instinct or intuition. And when we notice, throughout ancient and modern heathendom, the imperfection, the feebleness and the grossness, which by turns accompany and pervert, if they do not almost neutralize, the sense of the divine, the moral and the immortal, we must be allowed intirely to deny, what we understand Mr. Parker to assert, that these natural intuitions ascribe infinite perfection to the Deity, or exhibit anything beyond a very crude germ of conscience or immortality. And we are utterly at a loss to comprehend the propriety of calling this all-important but most rudimentary and gross Natural Religion by the high, pretentious title of the Absolute Religion. "What is in a name?" "A rose by any other name," &c., says the proverb. Logical ambiguities are in a name. Obscurity of thought lies hid in names. False pretensions are in names. In the common and definable sense of terms, the *Natural* Religion of mankind is anything but an *Absolute* Religion. It is the most vague, fluctuating, imperfect, impure and degrading mixture of great truths and almost as great fallacies, of natural aspirations and besetting doubt, error and sin. *Absolute* Religion! Why, all Natural Religion is *relative*, not absolute. It is all relative to country, age, climate, manners, institutions; relative also to the influences, direct or indirect, confessed or unconfessed, of Revealed Religion. Mr. Parker himself points out (in his *Discourse of Religion*) the grades of Natural Religion from Fetichism up to Philosophy; and we wonder that, while doing this, he should rank it all together as being or containing the Absolute Religion. It must be absolute in some other sense than that which would deny it to be relative. And, without levity or intended joke, we aver that its only claim to the title seems to us to consist in the absolutism of its professor.

We hesitate to ascribe to so thoughtful a writer the meaning which yet Mr. Parker's term *Absolute* Religion often *seems* to bear. We ask ourselves, Does he really aim at ascertaining what religion is *in itself*, as distinguished from the varying *conceptions*



of it by human minds? Does he search for the *absolute* as it really exists in the relations between God and man, and as absolutely known to the mind of God? Does he mean by the Absolute Religion that which is in itself the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth *of God*? We submit that this inquiry (which Mr. Parker often seems to us to be pursuing) is one which it is simply impossible for any human being to answer. He desires to conceive of religion apart from all human conceptions that limit or modify it,—*apart therefore from his own* human and necessarily imperfect conception. He must put himself in the place of God to pretend to this! He must be *infallible* in order to gain, and know that he has gained, the *absolute*. The moment any idea enters into a human mind, it is no longer absolute, but relative to that mind's powers and properties. When the wisest of us attempts to define what is the Absolute Religion, he only states his own individual conception of that absolute; he cannot in the nature of things do more. The Absolute Religion *as conceived by man* is absolute no longer. Religion, as variously conceived by man, may be defined of course as each man conceives it; or religion in its pure self, that is, the absolute nature and character of the Divine Being and the absolute position in which man stands towards Him, may be *reserved in the mind's conception as a separable thing* from what it knows or believes of religion in its own idea, or sees developed in that of others. We may also speak of this Absolute Religion, if we please, as a thing reserved from our actual reach,—as that which is in itself and is known to the all-knowing Intelligence, and that to which we desire that our own idea should be more and more conformed; but we can never safely affirm that our own highest and best idea of religion is actually conformable in all respects to the absolute nature of God and relations of man towards Him. Nay, rather, we are compelled by common humility to doubt whether, after our best efforts, it can be so. We can only hope, as our best dream of human perfectibility, that our idea may approach continually, and with it our conduct, more and more nearly to the Divine Idea and the Divine Will. This is only saying, in fact, that infallibility does not belong to the human mind. It is but recording the necessary condition of our knowledge.

Mr. Parker, following, we believe, in the steps of Kant, we must not say demonstrates, but infers rather, or perhaps more precisely *postulates*, the existence of a God in the following curious terms, to which we entreat the reader's careful attention:

“The existence of this religious element, of this sense of dependence, this sentiment of something without bounds, is itself a proof by implication of the existence of its object,—something on which dependence rests. A *belief in this relation* between the feeling in us and its object independent of us, comes *unavoidably* from the laws of man's nature. There is nothing of which we can be more certain. A natural want

in man's constitution *implies satisfaction in some quarter*, just as the faculty of seeing implies something to correspond to this faculty, namely, objects to be seen and a medium of light to see by. As the *tendency to love implies something lovely* for its object, so the religious sentiment implies its object. If it is regarded as a sense of absolute dependence, it implies the Absolute on which this dependence rests, independent of ourselves." (*Discourse of Matters pertaining to Religion*, b. i. ch. 2.)

By this short process, then, it is seriously proposed to settle the question of the existence of a God! The basis of religious argument is to be laid here. No more need of inductive proof from marks of design and benevolence, added to those of power, in the universe. No need even of the acute *à priori* attempt (which has been found, indeed, to involve a good deal of the *à posteriori* proof). The existence of the religious faculty in man proves at once the existence of its object, God. So the faculty of sight would prove the existence of light and visible objects to one who had been from birth in a cellar! So the faculty of loving would prove the existence of something lovely to a born slave who (to suppose a case) had never been permitted to receive kindness! Yes, truly; *on the assumption* that an *Infinite Wisdom has created all things*, we might argue that nothing can have been made in vain; that, therefore, as we have eyes there must be light, as we have ears there must be sound, and as we have a religious sense there must be God! But is not this the argument which logicians call *petitio principii*? You prove that Deity exists by assuming that *nothing exists without designed relation* to suitable objects. Is this philosophical? Is this rational? One only hesitates to charge upon names like those of Kant and Theodore Parker so childish a mistake as that of taking for granted the thing to be proved, and so of running round the vicious *circular syllogism* which proves nothing but the incompetence of the reasoner. But certainly the atheist (to whom, if to any one, the argument must be supposed to be addressed) would call it plainly what we have hinted. He would say, Of course, if you *assume* wise and benevolent arrangement to prevail throughout the universe, then every faculty in man must have its objects beyond himself. Of course, if you assume that "the existence of the religious element in man implies the existence of its object out of Him," then God is proved to exist because man can think he does. But I do not grant "that a belief in this relation between the feeling and its object comes unavoidably." It has never come to me. Reason with me if you will; but you must not assume the point of dispute between us in this absolute fashion.

Plainly, the atheistic controversy is left untouched by the proposed proof. We can only wonder how theists can feel their own theism to rest soundly on such an assumption. For ourselves, theists through the investigation of the works of creation



and the ways of Providence,—the investigation prompted, of course, by the religious faculty and craving, and leading on to Christian supplies of faith and hope,—we cannot let go our old inductive proofs on the invitation of an argument that professes to be so profoundly simple, yet turns out so transparently fallacious on investigation. We must still hold to Derham and Paley, and every equally good or better book of similar character; and having rationally inferred that the Great Object exists for whom our religious sense yearns, we may then indeed reasonably hope and trust and infer that every other faculty of our nature has its use, purpose and blessing. That the faculty of sight implies light, we need not, indeed, argue, as our eyes have experience of it; nor that hearing implies sound; nor that the stomach implies food, or the feet a solid earth to walk upon; because happily our experience in each case shews both the faculty and the provision made for its use. But there are grave occasions in our life in which some natural faculty or power or desire, bodily or mental, seems destitute of, or but inadequately provided with, the resources to which it seems to point somewhere beyond ourselves; and then we may indeed welcome, as a legitimate and blessed inference from the perceived harmonies and bounties of the Divine economy, the devout trust that these seemingly destitute powers and seemingly futile cravings have their purpose also, and will be satisfied or vindicated in the great result.

POSTSCRIPT. We do not willingly qualify the unreserved admiration above expressed for Mr. Parker's anti-slavery efforts; and, indeed, our painful reference now is to his most recent sayings on the subject, which we still believe are unparalleled by any expressions that he ever used before.

A letter from him to an anti-slavery friend in Boston, dated Rome, Nov. 25th, after hearing of John Brown's conviction and sentence, has been published in the New York *National Anti-slavery Standard* of Jan. 7th. Its expressions are, of course, strong and unmistakeable; its spirit is, of course, resolute, bold and brave; but at the same time, we must think, reckless and cruel; and in the interests of humanity we must doubt whether such counsel as he now gives bespeaks the wise friend of the slave.

In five brief propositions he lays it down as the natural right and duty of the slave to kill those who interfere with his liberty, and of any and all other true men to help him to do so. He "once hoped that American democracy would be engrossed in less costly ink (than blood); but it is plain now that our pilgrimage must lead through a Red Sea, wherein Pharaoh will go under and perish." He anticipates other similar attempts to Brown's, with apparent satisfaction: "Nine out of ten will fail, the tenth will succeed." "You and I prefer the peaceful

method; but I, at least, shall welcome the violent if no other accomplish the end."

Not every Christian abolitionist has nerve to anticipate, and by expressing his anticipations *virtually to promote and advise*, a servile war in America. We wonder how Theodore Parker has the heart to contemplate it except as an awful calamity, likely enough indeed, but to be deprecated and if possible averted by the wisdom and patience of the abolitionists.

### THE HARMONY OF THE SPHERES.

(FROM THE GERMAN OF PFEFFEL.)

A YOUTH by chance in Plato read  
That music by the spheres was made:  
"This concert must I hear," he cried,  
And straight to Jove his wish referred.  
To grant that wish the god denied:  
"Young fool, the concert of the spheres  
May not be heard by mortal ears."  
Unchanged remained the youthful will,  
He sought, implored, petitioned still;  
Till Jove at length his patience lost,  
Revoked his first ungracious word,  
And touched his ear. The stripling heard,  
And what? A frightful tumult burst.  
A thousand, thousand voicèd song  
Peal dread and deep the heavens along;  
Rattled and groaned a noise of war,  
And horror wild and falling far!  
O! all the thunders ever hurled  
By the Avenger on the world  
Were but the hum of bees at play  
To this tremendous roundelay.  
"Great Jove, what sounds are these I hear?"  
The youth exclaimed, o'ercome with fear;  
"Is this the heavenly harmony?  
So roars all hell around its prey;  
Nay, deafened let me rather be,  
Thou fearful god of all the gods."  
Jove answered from the thunder-clouds,  
"Know, feeble childing of a star,  
That men not gods but mortals are;  
*Thou* hear'st a tumult rend the skies,  
And *I* the heavenly harmonies!"

Rochdale, Jan. 13, 1860.

S. F. MACDONALD.



## MR. MEANS ON THE NATIONAL REVIEWER AND THE RESURRECTION.

SIR,

UNLESS the "Unitarian Minister" and the "Unitarian Layman" (whose prior claim, as the original critics of the *National Reviewer*, to be heard on this subject of the resurrection all must admit) so far occupy your pages as to leave no room for others, I venture to ask admission for a few remarks, springing from a deep conviction of the importance of the question both in itself and in its results, tempered by sincere admiration and regard for the excellent man on whose sentiments I am about to animadvert.

I understand the reviewer's hypothesis of the resurrection to be this:—that the existence of Jesus after death was, in some miraculous way, made manifest to his disciples, but not, as stated in the Gospels, by their becoming cognizant through their senses of his re-animated body; that this spiritual cognizance of his being alive is recorded by Paul, whose writings are the earliest extant testimony on the subject; that "in the reports handed down by tradition and misapprehended by the grosser mind of the multitude, these spiritual manifestations gradually assumed the form of bodily appearances," and that it is in this form they are recorded in the gospel narratives; that the belief of the ascension grew up as "a necessary complement" to the belief of a bodily resurrection; and, finally, that the Gospels, in their present form, cannot be traced to an earlier time than the second half of the second century, "though their substantial materials are an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age."

I have advisedly termed this view an hypothesis: for this word, as I judge, describes its true character, and that character constitutes a strong presumption against it. We are discussing a question of fact, recorded in several books of the New Testament, and we have presented to us a supposition as to what it was, in support of which there is not one tittle of positive evidence. I am aware that this assertion may appear presumptuous in the face of the reviewer's appeal to Paul, but I am not the less convinced that it is true.

But let us ask why Paul should be the first writer appealed to, as the reviewer contends, in preference to the authors of the Gospels. He does not write historically, he does not narrate events, but in the course of his argument refers to them as being already known to his readers. He appeals (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4) to their previous knowledge, and recalls, very briefly and summarily, what they knew. It is not, surely, from such a reference to things already known and recognized that we should "take our point of departure in this question," but from some fuller account

of the facts of the case, in order that we too may have that previous knowledge which Paul presumes in those to whom he was writing: and since the Gospels contain, as the reviewer admits, "an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age," we should rather resort to them in the first instance. It is surely more reasonable to interpret the brief reference by the fuller statement, than to reject or distort this because it differs from our interpretation of the briefer and less distinct reference. So that even if the reviewer's denial of the early origin of the Gospels be admitted, it does not follow that his preference of Paul's authority in this question is right. But leaving for the present the question of the date of the Gospels, and conceding Paul's claim to a prior hearing, let us see what he says.

He says that Christ "was seen." In the original, as in our version, the term used ordinarily expresses a sensible perception. The Greek *ὥφθη* is cognate with the word *ὄμματα*, "eyes." So that the most natural interpretation of Paul's words is, that the manifestation was to the sense of sight. Nor is there anything against this. Paul gives no countenance to the reviewer's interpretation; there is not the slightest hint that the manifestation was "spiritual." It is quite true, as the reviewer states, "that he puts his own seeing of Christ on the same level with that of the other apostles;" and "that he must have known from tradition whether they had conversed with a body or not." But this argument leads to a conclusion diametrically opposite to the reviewer's; for the earliest, indeed the only account we have of the appearances to them, viz., those in the Gospels, distinctly speak of a corporeal manifestation. If, then, Paul's seeing of Christ was like theirs, it was corporeal too; a conclusion to which the word *ὥφθη*, used by Paul, has already led us. There is yet another consideration. Paul's words are, "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures" (ver. 3, 4). Here are three things predicated of one subject in one sentence: he died, was buried, rose again: of these the burial is predicated of the body only; where, then, would be the propriety of its mention here, if the other terms denote simply a spiritual change? Where is the sequence or connection of incidents which affect, some only the body, and others only the soul?

The reviewer's appeal to Paul's testimony thus breaks down; and as Paul is his only witness, I am borne out in characterizing his view of the resurrection as a mere hypothesis or supposition: and the supposition of one, however eminent, living eighteen centuries after the event, and with no other sources of information than are open to us all, cannot for a moment weigh against contemporary, or nearly contemporary, evidence.



I pass on to the testimony of the four Gospels. I shall not here assume, what is, nevertheless, my firm belief, that they are the works of the writers whose names they bear, but will concede what the reviewer states, that none of them, in their actual form, can be proved to have been written anterior to the destruction of Jerusalem, or even the middle of the second century. I am not sure, however, whether I correctly interpret what the reviewer says of them, for his statements are not clear. "In Matthew," he tells us, "we have probably the original Palestinian tradition respecting Jesus." Mark's place he leaves undetermined. Between Matthew and Luke "there is a wide and perceptible difference, which implies the occurrence of a considerable interval of time." "The difference between John and any one of the three earlier Gospels is so marked, that it is hardly possible it should have been written till towards the end of the first century." Some of these statements are disputable enough, but I do not now stop to dispute them. I gather that he regards Matthew's as the earliest, and John's as the latest of the Gospels; and he seems to admit that they all four belong to the first century. As, however, he elsewhere says that they cannot be traced "in their present form" earlier than "the second half of the second century," he supposes, I presume, that they underwent some modification or corruption between the close of the first and the middle of the second century, though they still present "an authentic representation of the belief of the apostolic age." This is enough for me. Whether he admits that the Gospels were originally the works of their reputed authors, he does not say, and I shall not assume it; it is enough for us to take them as representing the general belief of the church at the close of the first century, or, if the reviewer requires it, in the middle of the second.

That belief was in a bodily resurrection, and in manifestations of it to the senses of sight, hearing and touch: we find it in all the Gospels and running through the whole narrative of the resurrection, in such a way that we cannot regard it as one of the later "elements of belief" by which the purity of apostolic tradition was contaminated, for its introduction must have involved a dissolution and reconstruction of the general belief. Let us see this. Beside the seeing and hearing of Jesus (and his words, let me observe, are conversational, often argumentative, being replies to objections or solutions of difficulties), the women held him by the feet (Matt. xxviii. 9); he sat down to meat with the disciples at Emmaus, and took bread and brake and gave to them; he shewed to the apostles his hands and his feet, took a piece of a broiled fish and of an honeycomb, and did eat it before them (Luke xxiv. 30, 40—43); pointed out to them that his hands were marked with the print of the nails, and his side torn with the spear; called them to dine, and dined with them, taking bread and fish and giving to them (John xx. 20, 27; xxi. 12, 13). Eliminate

from the narrative these particulars and all that must go with them, and what shall we have left?

But not only do the Gospels contain these particulars, but they represent Christ himself as arguing from them. When the disciples took him for a spirit, he said to them, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have" (Luke xxiv. 39). And again, he said, to the unbelieving Thomas, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing" (John xx. 27). Truly, Sir, if it were not that we could ill spare so excellent a man as the reviewer, I could wish that he had been then living and present to profit by so complete a refutation of his views.

This remonstrance of Christ suggests another argument against regarding the belief in the corporeal resurrection of Christ as a corruption of the earlier and purer tradition. Such corruption, had it taken place, would have naturally tended to conformity with the prevalent belief in disembodied spirits, which were then, as now, looked upon, inconsistently enough, as only semi-material; cognizable indeed by sight and hearing, but not by the grosser sense of touch. But the gospel narratives overpass the popular belief, and exceed it as far as the reviewer's hypothesis falls short of it. Nay, more than that, they distinctly contend against and refute it; so that we must suppose that not only was the earlier and purer belief corrupted by the growth of these corporeal views, but that the sacred records, and even the words of Christ himself, were interpolated or perverted to support the corruption.

I confess I am surprised at the plastic character which the reviewer and others ascribe to the faith of the first age. How astounding the change in the century from A.D. 50 to A.D. 150, and yet how silent, general and unopposed; a change, too, brought about not by the silent, almost unconscious, dropping of outworn dogmas, but by the incorporation in their belief, and that without evidence, of new particulars relating to outward things, tangible by human sense, the change into a material form of a purely spiritual occurrence which all born in the church must have known from childhood. For the resurrection of Christ was not a trivial incident little regarded, but a great central fact, without which, as the reviewer admits, the moral and spiritual power of the gospel is unaccountable.

And the documents, too, how plastic were they! The Church's records of the Saviour's life and words, and of the labours of apostles, received, so far as we can learn, without resistance or remonstrance, any new form which the ever-growing belief of the time might require; miracles were inserted, or (as in the present instance) invested with an altogether different character; the



earlier copies, precious from their age and, we may suppose, sacred from their authorship as well as their subject, were laid aside and left to disappear, not only from existence, but even from memory. Christ himself, on this supposition, was made, as we have seen, to argue for a view of his resurrection which was not thought of till many years after; and the discourses of Peter at Pentecost (Acts ii. 31) and to Cornelius (x. 41), and of Paul at Antioch of Pisidia (xiii. 34—37), were all invented or corrupted, so as to make them accord with the error of a later time. And for what are we to resort to the belief of this astounding and incredible pliability of early faith and early records? To enable us to receive some new hypothesis, sprung from the teeming invention of this nineteenth century. We are in this case to set aside all the evidence of the New Testament, and believe in a new miracle on which it is silent.

The difficulty of admitting the possibility of these astounding changes is increased by the consideration that the churches were scattered and mutually independent communities, not forming so compact a body as afterwards, when the hierarchy had completed its organization and established its power. The churches in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, communities gathered from among nations of different character and different language, to meet whose spiritual wants versions of the Scripture in their vernacular tongue were, if not yet provided, felt to be needed—all accepted silently and submissively the conversion from a spiritual to a corporeal form of the most influential of their convictions, and that at a time when their faith was at its greatest intensity and effectiveness.

The reviewer speaks (p. 45) of the vague, dim and visionary character of the resurrection. I presume he means of the narrative. To me it seems these terms are singularly inappropriate; for the accounts are surely remarkably distinct and clear. Let me apply a test. Would the most unimaginative painter be at a loss in representing any of the scenes of the resurrection; and would not the most imaginative be restrained by the fulness and distinctness of the narrative? Had Raphael any greater difficulty or greater freedom in painting Christ's charge to Peter than in his other cartoons? Yet it represents one of the scenes of the resurrection. The truth is, that the accounts are not dim and vague, but abrupt and fragmentary; and the very difficulties which the reviewer seems to feel are owing to this. They arise less from what is told than from what is not told. How Jesus came and went, where he was and what he did in the intervals between the scenes recorded in the narrative,—these are the difficulties; and they relate to things about which the history is silent. The reviewer is indeed perplexed that the disciples on the road to Emmaus did not recognize Christ; and his perplexity would be reasonable, were not his supposition that "the marks

on his hands and feet were conspicuous," gratuitous: coverings for the feet were in common use, and the hands might easily be hidden in the ample folds of an oriental garment; and if these marks were hidden, it was not marvellous that the disciples should fail to recognize one whom they knew to have died, whom certainly they did not expect to meet there and then, and who assumed the address and manner of a perfect stranger. So with the phrase, "he vanished out of their sight," or rather, "he disappeared (*ἄφαντος ἐγένετο*) from them," the whole difficulty arises from our translators having unwisely used the ghost-like word "vanished." When the disciples recovered from their joyful surprise on recognizing Jesus, he was gone. They saw him not: that they have told us. How and where he went they have not told us, for they did not know. Again, it is felt by the reviewer and by one of his critics that it is incredible that Jesus should have been forty days in Galilee, and should not have been seen by any but believers. On all recorded occasions none but believers appear to have been there, and of other times the history is silent; but I cannot see that there would have been any great difficulty in a man escaping recognition whose death was well known to all, but whose resurrection was not yet proclaimed abroad or even rumoured, and who desired to conceal himself.

In truth, the very abruptness and consequent difficulty of the narrative bespeak, to me, both its early origin and its uncorruptness. The narrative is abrupt, because the appearances it records were so. What the authors knew they recorded; what they knew not they did not attempt to supply from any inventive stores of their own; and imagination, elsewhere so busy, was restrained by reverence from tampering with these sacred records, notwithstanding the temptation which their obvious gaps presented.

There are two particulars in the narrative of the resurrection which necessarily imply that it was bodily, and which must have been included in the original belief,—the empty tomb, and the third day. The empty tomb lies at the foundation of the whole account. This first draws attention, occasions perplexity, excites hope. The whole belief of the resurrection was built first on this, as the belief of the resurrection was itself the corner-stone of the church. All the Gospels mention it and the surprise which it occasioned; the unbelieving Jews admitted it, and accounted for it by a tradition which was still current when Matthew's Gospel took its present form (Matt. xxviii. 15). This, then, at any rate, is a fact. Yet what but a bodily resurrection could have left the tomb empty? Ewald's supposition that some of the disciples removed the body from reverence for their Master, is childish and absurd in the extreme. The disciples at large knew nothing of such a removal; those in whose care the body was, the affectionate women, knew nothing of it, for they



were baffled by it in their purpose of completing their offices of love. If removed from reverence, the place where it was carried to would have been known and cherished. I repeat it, that nothing but a bodily resurrection could have left an empty tomb; and that this was left was admitted from the first.

So too with the fixing of the resurrection to the third day. Christ himself foretold it again and again; the evangelists recorded it; the apostles proclaimed it. But how could evangelists or apostles or any mortals know the time of the spirit's unseen transition to another state? Observe that the passages all speak of Christ's resurrection, not of his manifestation to his disciples. That, indeed, was on the third day, but it is not that of which the predictions or the records speak. It is, "the Son of Man shall rise again," or "Christ rose again on the third day." And this rising on the third day is mentioned by Paul in the passage (1 Cor. xv. 4) quoted by the reviewer; and thus, again, the belief of this chosen witness is identified with that of other Christians as a belief in a bodily resurrection.

I have not spoken of the ascension, but my argument includes it. I agree with the reviewer that it is the necessary complement of a bodily resurrection; I cannot, therefore, "throw it overboard," nor do I wish to do so.

Apologizing for this intrusion on your patience, and again expressing my very hearty respect for the reviewer, while dealing thus freely with his views, I am, &c.,

JOSEPH CALROW MEANS.

Grove Street, South Hackney, Jan. 7, 1860.

REV. S. BACHE ON THE ARTICLE IN THE NATIONAL REVIEW.

SIR,

IF the controversy which has been carried on in your pages by "the Author of the Article in the National" and others were of a personal character, I should feel it to be both unjust and impertinent in me to intermeddle with it; but the facts on which it all turns appear to me of such infinite moment, that I cannot consent to remit them to the region of what may be called, for distinction's sake, a philosophical or metaphysical, as opposed to an historical theology, without recording my decided, though personally most respectful, protest against the views which have been advanced respecting them, and the arguments or suggestions by which an attempt is made to weaken, if not destroy, the direct testimony of the Gospels to their reality.

Permit me also to record *in limine* my entire sympathy with the author of the article in the National, in the "common result" which he so touchingly delineates (p. 47) as that of his own

personal experience; and to assure him and your readers in general that nothing but a deep and ever-increasing conviction of the obligation to maintain what we deem important truth, though ever in the spirit of love, would induce me to stand forth in even seeming opposition to one towards whom it is impossible for any one who knows him to feel otherwise than the most cordial respect and affection, and under whose censure, as guilty of "the folly of bigotry and the presumption of dogmatism" (p. 47), I am individually most reluctant to risk falling. But by my very profession I am bound to "contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3); and I trust that I shall not be unmindful of the equally powerful obligation to contend "lawfully," and in a spirit worthy of its sacred character.

I have read with attention this remarkable controversy, and find myself at issue with the National Reviewer, not merely in regard to the views at which he arrives, but in his very mode of arriving at them. That mode, as I understand it, is as follows: (I abridge the statements in pp. 44, 45)—Paul's is the oldest testimony to the resurrection of Christ: we must therefore take our departure from his statements, and construct [*query, construe?*] from his point of view the statements of the Gospels. Now Paul puts his own seeing of Christ on the same level as that of the other apostles— $\omega\phi\theta\eta$ . Hence these "manifestations of the risen Jesus were real and of a living presence, but not conveyed through the outward sense." When Docetic errors began to prevail, Christians unconsciously interpreted the traditional accounts of these spiritual manifestations in a more outward and corporeal sense, "doctrinal reaction aiding the development of the idea of a bodily resurrection."

1. On this argument I have first to remark, that I do not understand how the word  $\omega\phi\theta\eta$  in this connection comes to mean "manifestations not conveyed through the outward sense." The facts just before mentioned (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4) are, that Christ died and was buried and rose again the third day, and then was seen ( $\omega\phi\theta\eta$ ) by Cephas, &c. Are not all these facts narrated as alike discernible, and actually discerned, through the senses? Does Paul give us any intimation that some of them were so discerned and others not? And does the National Reviewer admit Paul's repeated narrative of his own conversion, as recorded in the Acts of the Apostles, to be historically true; and, if so, will he contend that the incidents there narrated were "manifestations not conveyed through the outward sense"? The argument on this point seems to me to break down altogether.

2. But even were it capable of being established, I must still protest, and with yet greater earnestness, against explaining the statements of the Gospels by this assumption. For observe its real character. The risen Saviour manifests himself to Paul *after* his own ascension, and therefore confessedly when no longer



encompassed with a mortal body. Therefore even *before* his ascension he manifests himself in the same way to his apostles. Such is the assumption of the National Reviewer. True, the Gospels tell a very different story; but then “we find no distinct allusion to any of them by name before the second half of the second century” (p. 43). Why is this circumstance alleged? For the purpose of explaining how the traditional accounts of Christ’s spiritual intercourse with his disciples after his death became hardened into statements of his actual bodily appearance. The same process must necessarily be applied also to the history of the Acts of the Apostles; and Peter’s declaration in the very passage commented on by the National Reviewer (Acts x. 41), “Even to us who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead,” must be eliminated on the very same principle.

On this argument I have three remarks to make:—1. That it appears to me highly improbable, in the very nature of things, that we *should* find any distinct allusion to any of the Gospels *by name* at an earlier period, and that the fact of our finding it at that period implies not merely the existence, but the general and reverential recognition, of these Gospels, in preference to many others which were rejected as less worthy of credit, *for a very long antecedent period*. (See this argument clearly stated and established in Norton’s *Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels*, Vol. I. p. 122, seq. London, 1847.) 2. That if objection be taken to the history of Christ’s *resurrection* on this ground, the same objection may be taken to the entire history; in consistency, I think it *must* be taken; and then, with the Docetæ, we change the whole earthly life of Christ into a phantom, or reject the evangelical histories of it altogether. 3. That if the body of Jesus were not raised and re-animated and miraculously removed from this earth, its detection was, under the circumstances, inevitable, and his doctrine would then have perished with him.\*

3. All sound philosophy must be based on the patient investigation and clear discovery of *facts*; inasmuch as it consists in ascertaining not what God *might* do (for this is infinitely beyond our comprehension), but what he has *actually done*. Now no Christian can doubt for a moment the possibility of “the direct communication of spiritual truth to our human consciousness” (p. 40), inasmuch as such truth was actually communicated to

---

\* See Miall’s *Bases of Belief* (p. 266), for reasoning on this subject which is to my mind conclusive, and which I have certainly never seen answered. Anything more absurd than Ewald’s perfectly gratuitous assumption (quoted in *Christian Reformer*, 1859, p. 578), I think I have never read in my life. The ascension being “the necessary sequel” (p. 45) of the resurrection, and being, from its very nature, the affair of comparatively a few moments,—being farther confirmed by the gift of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost,—neither required nor admitted narrative details so minute and continuous as we have of the resurrection.

the consciousness of Christ. But, if we may believe the gospel histories, it was accompanied with such *attestations* of its divine origin and character as not only warranted Jesus himself in claiming to be "a teacher come from God," but as required others reverently to acknowledge that claim. Take away these *credentials*, and I think it will be impossible to shew that Jesus might not have been himself deceived. If you allege that the integrity and purity of his life are the all-sufficient attestations to the contrary, what will you make, I ask, of the visions and revelations of Baron Swedenborg, and why do you not believe in them? For myself, I understand the conviction avowed by Nicodemus on the ground on which he has placed it (John iii. 2); take away that ground, and it appears to me that you take away all rational conviction along with it.

4. The National Reviewer calls it (p. 34) "a great mistake to treat Christianity so entirely as an isolated event—a fact *sui generis*—in the course of human affairs." Unless there be an extraordinary emphasis on the words "so entirely" which would make them imply that Christianity in conjunction with Judaism is *not at all* recognized as a part of the great plan of Providence for the education of our race, I would ask, Is it *not*, then, "a fact *sui generis*"? If not, what other fact of the same kind can you adduce? We have no *such* revelation anywhere else, have we? If we have, where?

5. I do not hesitate to avow myself one of those who feel that what are called the *natural* arguments for a future life, derive all their power from the special confirmation afforded by the gospel. *With* that confirmation, they are to my mind irresistible; *without* it (as I have again and again felt when looking on the lifeless remains of the beloved departed), they would give me *no confidence whatever*. The physical difficulty would have proved insurmountable to me; the sight of the stiff, cold corpse would have outweighed ten thousand philosophical arguments and chilled my warmest aspirations. And that it actually *did* so in ancient times with even the most enlightened and philosophic-minded men, see Servius Sulpicius' letter of consolation to Cicero on the death of Tullia, and how Cicero accepts the miserable consolation as the *only* consolation which it was possible for him to receive. (Ad Diversos, iv. 5, 6.) See also Kenrick's Roman Sepulchral Inscriptions. "Upon the whole (writes this learned and discriminating author), the evidence, negative even more than positive, of the Roman sepulchral inscriptions, abundantly confirms the testimony of heathen as well as Christian writers, to the absence of any definite and practical belief in a future state, in the three or four first centuries after the Christian æra" (p. 56). See also Dr. Ephraim Peabody's Christian Days and Thoughts, from which the following quotation is given in the Christian Reformer for 1859, p. 245:



“Christianity met that fact [of universal death] by the only evidence with which it could be met—it met the *skepticism* of the senses by an *evidence addressed to the senses*,—by the resurrection from the dead. We talk of spirituality, as if it did not need this visible evidence. Let us thank God that He is more merciful than our folly asks. Somehow, here, our souls are connected with the body; and high as we may soar in faith, the highest flight must start from the earth. And God has given just the evidence we need for the immortal life, in the resurrection of Christ.”

For myself, therefore, I entirely adopt the sentiment of the apostle (1 Cor. xv. 57), without any qualification whatever, “Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.” I gratefully own that if the victory be mine at all, it is “through our Lord Jesus Christ,” and through no other agency whatever. Believing that because he lives we shall live also, I am enabled correctly to appreciate those internal spiritual evidences of my immortal destiny which, in the light of his gospel and resurrection, approve themselves as of inestimable value, but which, without such light, I might perhaps never have seen at all.

And living as we do, thank God! in the full effulgence of this Sun of righteousness, I can well understand how many Christians of a philosophical turn of mind may occasionally forget (especially when philosophizing) where their daylight really comes from; and so they give the preference to the dim spiritual insight afforded by nature above the clear revelation of divine truth. In this they do but imitate the wisdom of the memorable sage who is said to have pronounced the moon more useful to us than the sun; “because (said he) the moon often gives us light in the night when it would be dark without her; whereas the sun shines only in the daytime when we don’t want him at all.” In many of our chiefest blessings, we have to overcome the blinding influence of habit before we are able to discern their true source.

I have been carried on by my deep interest in this subject to a much greater length than I at first intended, though I have only noted down some leading points of the argument, and briefly intimated my views respecting each point. I have endeavoured to treat the great question entirely on its own merits; and I shall be the first to regret if I have suffered any expression to escape me which is offensive to those from whom I cannot help widely differing in opinion, but for whom personally, notwithstanding such difference, I have the most sincere and cordial respect. Clear and strong as are my convictions, I trust that I am not inaccessible to correction wherever I may be in error; and I have the most perfect and unwavering confidence in the supreme value of truth as truth, be it what and where it may:

only should I ever find that it is *not* in the Gospels, I shall lose no time in endeavouring to correct the mistake of my life by exposing the fallacies by which I have been misled. At present, however, it is without doubt or distrust, and with the full consent of my judgment and feelings, that I authenticate the foregoing views as my own, by subscribing myself, Sir, respectfully yours,

SAMUEL BACHE.

*Edgbaston, January 30, 1860.*

---

#### LIFE AND LETTERS OF SCHLEIERMACHER.\*

AFTER the lapse of a full quarter of a century since his death, the personal history of the great Berlin theologian has at length been given to the public, in a form which, however it may satisfy his surviving friends and admirers as a faithful picture of his life, will scarcely, we may expect, attract any large circle of readers in this country. The work is, indeed, on several accounts, sufficiently interesting. It discloses much of the mental growth and character of one who was long the leading religious philosopher, not of a small sect, but of a great people, himself conspicuous among the most eminent of his contemporaries. It exhibits also the deep, affectionate and religious nature of the man, shewing us how strongly he attached to him his personal friends, and how closely he clung to them as necessary to his existence. Yet many of these are persons now little known or cared for; the circumstances which connected Schleiermacher with them are often too slightly, or not at all, explained in these pages; and altogether there is a preponderance of mere feeling and sentimentality, and a want of outward incident and action, in the work, private and public, which must tend to prevent it from reaching any but the comparative few who may already be somewhat familiar with the works and influence of this distinguished man.

It is one of the features now alluded to, that there is so little of reference in the work to the hurricane of exciting political events which swept over Europe during the first thirty-six years of Schleiermacher's life (which period, comprised in the first volume, the present article more especially includes). Connected though he was with public persons, and even, indirectly, with one of the leading governments of the day, he might almost have been the inhabitant of another planet, for anything that appears in his letters on such topics. We do not know whether there has been any intentional suppression, or whether the blank be

---

\* The Life of Schleiermacher, as unfolded in his *Autobiography and Letters*. Translated from the German by Frederica Rowan. 2 vols. London—Smith, Elder and Co.



only a natural result of the political system in which he grew up, but the omission is great and obvious. Schleiermacher would seem to have been too entirely absorbed in his own thoughts and feelings, in the pleasant society of his Berlin friends, especially those of the gentler sex, in his sermons, his Plato, and so on, to have had a thought or a word for such purely extraneous matters. Happy the man who thus, from Olympian heights of philosophy and literature, can look so calmly down upon a convulsed and tottering world! But this sort of isolation or indifference (or what shall we call it?) does not add to the interest of his letters or his life, to the readers of a new generation and a distant country.

It is, however, at the same time fair to remember that the work does not profess to give any full account of Schleiermacher's public life. The translator observes that she "undertook to introduce to the English reader the *man* Schleiermacher, not the theologian,"—"the man and his private life," as portrayed in these letters. Let us also be careful not to do an injustice. The foregoing remark relates strictly to the period above mentioned. We shall find that, later in his life, the theologian manifested no small amount of patriotic zeal and energy; but it would seem to have required even the fatal year of Jena and its consequences to rouse him, so far, at least, as we can gather from the letters before us.

After all, it is a venial fault that a man keeps closely to what he feels to be his proper vocation, and becomes wholly absorbed in its duties; and, with all drawbacks of the kind mentioned, we have read this work with interest and profit. The development of such a mind as Schleiermacher's will always afford a worthy subject of study; while the glimpses here given of an age now passed away, and of persons some of whose names are still famous among us—Kant, Fichte, the Schlegels, Tieck, Schelling, Jean Paul—are additional sources of attraction. We propose, in this and another article, to give our readers some account of the contents of these volumes—simply of these volumes, i.e. of the leading incidents of Schleiermacher's life as here presented; for of his religious philosophy and the kindred subjects, or generally of his works, or his influence as a writer and teacher, we cannot undertake to speak at all minutely. Such a task would far exceed the limits of our space and time, even were other requisites for the work fully at our command.

Schleiermacher's father was a chaplain in the Prussian army, and at the time of his son's birth, November 21, 1768, was stationed at Breslau, in Silesia. The boy soon proved himself intelligent and precocious, going to school at five years of age, and distancing older competitors in Latin and other subjects. The account of these early years appears partly in letters of his parents, and partly in an autobiographical sketch written by himself for the ecclesiastical authorities, when a candidate for ordination as a

preacher. This sketch is too brief to be in itself of great interest, but it throws light on the letters which follow it. In due time, after some years of the ordinary school instruction, the boy is sent, with his younger brother, to the establishment of the Moravian Brethren at Niesky, in Prussian Lusatia, some distance north-east of Bautzen. Here, and afterwards in the college of the Brethren at Barby, he pursues his studies evidently with great care and success, but ever under the influence of the religious doctrines of his teachers. The high orthodox tone of his earlier letters, as well as of those of his parents, will strike every reader. These letters reveal to us the close and affectionate union existing between the members of a pious family; but it is not until we come to the point where Schleiermacher finds himself compelled to give up some of the religious doctrines in which he has been educated, that we meet with matter of more than ordinary interest. We see, too, in the case of both Schleiermacher and his sister Charlotte, something of the interior life of the Moravian institutions. What we learn is neither very complete nor very prepossessing. The good Brethren seem to have gone on the plan of shutting out the light, and of putting down doubts and false doctrine by a careful discharge of the routine duties of their position,—a course for which the authority of great names in our own country might be cited. The young inquirer could obtain no help from them in his doubts and difficulties; in fact, he is soon made to understand that his only course is to quit the establishment.

The change referred to is in every way a remarkable one, in a youth of eighteen brought up as Schleiermacher had been, and discloses in him great independence and strength of character. He thus makes his disbelief known to his father, under date of Jan. 21, 1787:

“I confessed to you, in my last letter, my dissatisfaction with the limited scope of my position here, and pointed out how easily, under such circumstances, religious doubts may, in our times, arise among young people. I thus endeavoured to prepare you for the intelligence that these doubts have been awakened in me, but I did not attain my object. You believed that your answer had set me at rest; and for six whole months I most unjustifiably remained silent, because I could not find it in my heart to destroy this illusion.

“Faith is the regalia of the Godhead, you say. Alas! dearest father, if you believe that, without this faith, no one can attain to salvation in the next world, nor to tranquillity in this—and such, I know, is your belief—oh! then, pray to God to grant it to me, for to me it is now lost. I cannot believe that He, who called Himself the Son of Man, was the true, eternal God: I cannot believe that His death was a vicarious atonement, because He never expressly said so Himself; and I cannot believe it to have been necessary, because God, who evidently did not create men for perfection, but for the pursuit of it, cannot possibly intend to punish them eternally, because they have not attained it.

"Alas! best of fathers, the deep and acute suffering which I endure while writing this letter, prevents me from giving you in detail the history of my soul as regards my opinions, or all my strong reasons for entertaining them; but I implore you, do not look upon them as merely transient views, without deep roots. During almost a whole year they have had a hold upon me, and it is long and earnest reflection that has determined me to adopt them. I entreat you not to keep back from me your strongest counter-reasons; but I candidly confess that I do not think you will succeed in convincing me *at present*, for I hold firmly by my convictions."—I. 46, 47.

The distress of the poor father on receiving this communication is terrible. He thus replies, anger and disappointment, religious zeal and fatherly affection, alternating throughout a long letter:

"Oh, thou insensate son! who has deluded thee, that thou no longer obeyest the truth, thou, before whose eyes Christ was pictured, and who now crucifigest him? You were so well started, who has held you back from obeying the truth? Such persuasion is not from Him who has called you; but a little leaven leavens the whole loaf. The same wickedness of heart which, four years ago, made you fear that through it you would be lost in the world, and which drove you into the congregation, alas! you have furthermore nourished in yourself, and it has now leavened your whole being, and is driving you out of the congregation. Oh! my son—my son! How deeply do you humble me! What sighs you call forth from my soul! And if the departed watch over us, oh! what a cruel disturber of the tranquillity of your blessed mother have you become, now that even your stranger stepmother is weeping over you." I. 50.

Again, in the same letter:

"And now, O son, whom I press with tears to my sorrowful heart! with heartrending grief I discard thee, for discard thee I must, as thou no longer worshippingst the God of thy fathers, as thou no longer kneelest at the same altar with him—yet, once more, my son, before we part—oh! tell me, what has the poor, meek, and humble-hearted Jesus done to thee, that thou renouncest his strength and his divine peace? Did you find no consolation when you laid before Him your need, the anguish of your heart? And now, in return for the divine long-suffering and patience with which He listened to you, you deny Him? You break the promise which you so often pronounced: with Thee Jesus I will abide? Why wouldst thou leave Him?—hast thou never received the word of life from Him?"—I. 52.

The letters which pass between Schleiermacher and his father at this period are affecting. The affliction of the latter in particular is very touching; though we confess we are at a loss to understand why a man who had himself, as he says, preached during *twelve years*, though "a real unbeliever," should so greatly have taken to heart his son's honest avowal of his new opinions. It would almost seem as if he would have preferred that he should have concealed them, and gone on with his education professing to believe what he thought untrue, lest he should cut himself off from future preferment and throw himself upon his father for



support, for an indefinite period. We cannot reconcile such a supposition with much that is both sensible and devout in the elder Schleiermacher's letters. At any rate, the firmness of the son did not yield, and, with the aid and counsel of a very kind and judicious uncle, his mother's brother, he carried his point of being allowed to go to Halle to study for a year or two, with the view of making himself "efficient for some tutorship or other."

In connection with this change, we see clearly the straitened circumstances of the father, and his inability to do more than provide the merest necessities for his son. He speaks frequently of his poverty, especially warning his son against purchasing *books*, as long as he can avoid it (p. 127), an extravagance which seems to have involved the good man himself in lasting troubles. To Halle, however, Schleiermacher goes, and is there provided with a little room in the house of his kind uncle, his great obligations to whom he acknowledges in very warm terms, in the autobiographical sketch before mentioned.

Of Schleiermacher's student life at Halle we learn very little. The most interesting passage relating to this period occurs in one of his later letters, in which he writes:

"First of all, let me give you a testimonial, or, rather, a sketch of my character, while I was at the university, which somebody, I no longer recollect whom, gave to my father. He communicated it to me afterwards, and even at the present moment I cannot conceive who it can have been who knew me so well then, when I hardly associated with any one. I was, he said, negligent in my person; had entirely the manners of one whose eye is turned inwardly; was cynical in my whole mode of life; very frugal when alone, but when in society, and to please my friends, capable of sacrificing even my most urgent necessities; industrious, but only by starts, and at all times a very unsteady attendant at the professorial lectures, which I seemed to despise; for the rest, seeking concealment, but when thrown into the society of the rich and high-born, behaving as if I were both in a still higher degree; cold and proud towards all who held a higher position than myself, but more especially so to my teachers and superiors."—I. 308.

Two years, indifferently used, at the university soon passed away. He then went to spend a year with his uncle, who had now exchanged his professorship for a living at Drossen (eastward of Frankfort-on-the-Oder). This appears to have been a year of much quiet study and progress in knowledge. "Then, also" (he says), "I began, for the first time, to think of the future; and, not without serious misgivings, I presented myself for the *pro licentia*, which I passed in the summer of 1790." In a letter from Drossen of this period, he gives his father a full account of his theological and philosophical reading, from which we see that he was now, at least, working hard, and preparing with diligence and success for his approaching examination. He does not conclude without a little appeal on money matters: ". . . my

clothes" (he says), "are in such a dilapidated condition that I can hardly appear here with decency, let alone undertake a journey to Berlin."

Schleiermacher next obtained the situation of private tutor in the family of Count Dohna, at Schlobitten (south of Königsberg), and spent three years here, on the whole usefully and happily, if not very lucratively, employed. He appears to have preached occasionally at this period, and some very sensible advice from his father on the subject of sermons might here be quoted, did our space allow. The young man himself complains of the *heaviness and indistinctness* of his own sermons, and has asked for the good counsels of his experienced parent. The latter, among other things, recommends Blair as likely to help him to correct the faults of which he has spoken. Should any of our readers want a good subject for a sermon, or rather for a series of sermons, he will find one at p. 111, as well as some practical remarks on the same subject; e.g., "... You have not sufficiently held in mind that you were addressing a mixed auditory. The poor peasant also wishes to be edified, and his wish ought not to be overlooked." Again, "As regards the desire to exhaust the subject, ever remember that you are not carrying on a disputation, but that you are delivering an edifying discourse, and save your powers of exhaustion for your private conversations. For these latter also, secondly, reserve the desire to look at the subject from a new side."

During the Schlobitten period, Schleiermacher visits Königsberg, and spends "half an hour with Mr. Kant and a few other professors," of whom, however, he modestly refrains from giving any report, on the ground that so brief an interview is insufficient to enable him to say more than whether the great men are like their busts or portraits,—a remark that might be advantageously remembered by lionizers in general.

The engagement with the Dohnas is brought to a somewhat abrupt termination through the hasty temper of the head of the family. Schleiermacher returns to his uncle's at Drossen without any definite prospects, but by and by he obtains the situation of teacher in an institution in Berlin, for training schoolmasters, at a small salary of 120 dollars (about £18) a-year. Of this he says himself, "That I shall have a very hard time of it at first, and that my little savings will be swallowed up at once, is very evident; nevertheless, I do not see what else can be done, and I live in the hope that everything will turn out for the best."

But better things were in store for him, and it is not long before he is appointed assistant to an aged relative, the pastor of a church at Landsberg, with the prospect of succeeding him in his office. Here he remained until 1796. We see, too, that he is already beginning to attract notice as a preacher; as he says

to his father, "I do not expect that this running to hear me will continue; perhaps it will be the fashion a few weeks longer, and then it will cease like all fashions; but from my heart" (he adds) "I do wish that God's blessing may be upon my sermons, so that they may be sources of true edification and speak to the heart, as, I trust, they will ever come from the heart." He little foresaw the future that lay before him in Berlin, where, as we are told, "children crowded to his religious lessons, and men and women of the highest culture hung upon his lips when he addressed them from the pulpit." He as little anticipated that he should ever become eminent as an author.

This appointment at Landsberg is an evident source of satisfaction to the elder Schleiermacher. It does not appear what had become of the disbelief in the atonement and the deity of Christ. Most probably so able and subtle a mind would easily harmonize all such private difficulties with his open acceptance of the established formulas,—and that, too, without any greater sacrifice of truthfulness and consistency, in his own esteem, than is made by many of the signers of our Thirty-nine Articles at the present day. The father does not, so far as we learn, trouble himself on the subject, and his death shortly afterwards removed him out of the reach of all such sublunary troubles. The letter which Schleiermacher wrote to his sister Charlotte on this event, one of the most touching and beautiful in the collection, closes what may be called the first, or preparatory, period of his life.

In two years we find him again in Berlin, where he is "appointed chaplain to the establishment of the *Charité*," and where he remains till 1802. This interval of six years materially alters his position. He becomes conscious of his powers, and enters, we may say, upon a life of great intellectual and literary activity,—the forerunner of still greater distinction at Halle, and, later again, in Berlin. He now forms an intimate connection with various persons, remarkable both for their social position and their intellectual culture. Among these are F. Schlegel, with whom Schleiermacher for some time resides in common lodgings, and with whom he plans and begins the translation of Plato, which, however, was soon left by Schlegel entirely in his hands. Of his female friends at this time the most memorable is Henrietta Herz, the wife of a Jewish physician, who appears to have exercised a most important and beneficial influence on Schleiermacher, stimulating and even aiding his literary labours. Many of his letters are addressed to this lady, disclosing the very intimate and affectionate terms on which they lived. So much was this the case that his sister's fears appear to have been aroused, and to have led her to remonstrate with him on the subject. More than once he has to explain and justify to her his relation to his female friends. Here is a passage to this effect:

"One thing I am convinced you will believe on my word, viz., that



in my relations with those ladies there is nothing that could, even with the slightest appearance of justice, be unfavourably interpreted; you have not, I am sure, detected any evidence of passion in anything I have said about them, and I declare to you that I do not feel the least indication of anything of the kind. The time that I spend with them is by no means devoted to amusement only, but contributes directly to increase my knowledge and to stimulate my intellect, and I am in like manner useful to them. That Mrs. Herz is a Jewess did not seem at first to make such a very unfavourable impression upon you, and I thought that you felt as I do, that when there is a question of friendship, when we find a mind constituted like our own, we are bound to overlook such matters. The intercourse with her is not either so incompatible with my outward circumstances as you seem to suppose. Mr. Teller and Mr. Zöllner, two highly esteemed clergymen, both frequently visit the Herzes, though not on the same intimate and affectionate footing as I do; but it seems to me that if it be allowed to set aside an ancient prejudice for a less important purpose, it must be still more justifiable to do so for a higher object, and when the intercourse sought is of a more elevated nature."—I. 185, 186.

Schleiermacher's danger lay, however, in this very quarter. He became acquainted with, and then, strangely enough (but it was a fashion of the time), strongly attached to, Eleanore Grunow, the wife of a clergyman in Berlin, between whom and herself, we are told, in the mysterious language suited to such a subject, "all the essential inward conditions" of a true marriage were wanting. The tone of feeling in regard to divorce and re-marriage prevailing at this time in Berlin society, and indeed still too marked a feature in the social life of Germany, is well shewn in the account which the editors give of this unhappy passage of Schleiermacher's history:

"He believed" (we are told) "that were the connection" (i.e., between Eleanore G—— and her husband) "to be continued, her inner life could not fail to be entirely destroyed, and his opinions at that time (as he repeatedly expressed them without reference to this particular case) were in favour of the dissolution of such inwardly false unions. He even regarded such dissolution as *a moral duty*, in as far as it could take place without infringement of the social laws, which he demanded should be held in proper respect, while he considered the outward union as decidedly immoral, and as one which ought never to have been formed. These views were undoubtedly quite in accordance with the whole turn of his mind at that period, and indeed with those tendencies of the times in which he most participated, and there is, therefore, the less reason to suppose that they arose out of his personal relations to Eleanore G——. However, they favoured his hopes of happiness in connection with his earnest attachment to this lady; and although he considered the dissolution of her marriage as a thing morally called for, independently of any further eventuality, it was, nevertheless, understood, that when she should be free, he would marry her. Eleanore G——, however, could never, with full conviction, assent to these views; and after a long struggle and many hesitations, which Schleiermacher regarded as proofs of weakness, she at length determined to renounce

him (in the autumn of 1805): and from that moment all communication between them ceased entirely."—I. 142, 143.

Extracts from letters to this lady, as well as in reference to her, are given in the collection, from which we learn the strength of Schleiermacher's attachment, and finally the extreme distress which the rupture of the connection causes him.

A similar extraordinary fortune, but with a different result, befel his friend Schlegel. He also conceived a strong passion for the too celebrated Dorothea Veit, the young and accomplished wife of a Berlin banker. The latter is brought, by the intervention of Henrietta Herz, to consent to a divorce, and even grants a pecuniary provision to the future Mrs. Schlegel, generously allowing his eldest boy to remain with the mother, and paying her a considerable sum for his maintenance! In reference to this curious history, Schleiermacher gives us the following expression of his feelings in a letter to his sister:

"I have not felt anger against Mrs. Veit, but the extraordinary change in her destiny, and the strange and culpable light in which I know her conduct will be viewed by the world, grieves me very much, and is a source of deep anxiety to me, because she and Schlegel are so dear to my heart. In our opinion, who are so thoroughly acquainted with all the circumstances, she had very good and sufficient reasons for leaving this place. Schlegel's brother and sister-in-law invited her to their house, and she is now staying with them in Jena. Friedrich is also staying at Jena, and you may suppose what the world thinks of this and of the whole connection. They would, indeed, ere this, have contracted holy and legal bonds, as they are in truth most deeply attached to each other, were it not rendered impossible by the only condition on which her husband will consent to a divorce, viz., that she shall give up to him her youngest boy, who still requires her maternal care and the sensible education which she gives him. . . . It is a most unfortunate affair, and from the bottom of my heart I pity the two people, who are exposed to so many humiliations only because they have acted more simply and uprightly than the world is accustomed to see people act." I. 243.

The intimate footing on which Schleiermacher stood with these Berlin friends appears in his own account of the celebration of his twenty-ninth birthday, also written for his sister. The whole scene is thoroughly German in its spirit, just such an incident as might take place any day among intimate friends:

"I was sitting in deep *négligé* at breakfast in the morning, when the eldest Dohna, who had not been to see me since his return, made his appearance. He stayed unusually long, and looked so often out of the window, that I could hardly help suspecting that there was something in the wind, though I could not imagine what it might be. At length came his brother, who began with expressing his congratulations, and I thus perceived that my birthday had been betrayed; and very soon after drove up a carriage with Mrs. Herz—whom I frequently visit with the Dohnas—and Mrs. Veit, the lady at whose house I was to spend the evening with Schlegel. The husbands of the two ladies sent

to excuse their absence on account of business. Suddenly my table was cleared, and again spread with chocolate and cakes, which had been ordered by Dohna. The most cordial congratulations poured in on me from all sides, as did also little presents, to keep up my remembrance of this friendly festivity. Mrs. Herz gave me a watch-guard, because my chain was in a most deplorable condition; Mrs. Veit gave me a pair of gloves and a wine-glass, out of which to drink the Burgundy which she had ordered for my stomach; and Schlegel, a small bottle of perfume for my linen, which he knows I am very fond of. You may conceive how delighted I was with these proofs of the sympathy of five persons who are very dear to me, and for that very reason how little I could say about it.

"Schlegel played me a little trick, by inciting the others to join *in choro* in his old wish that I should be industrious, that is to say, that I should write books. Nine-and-twenty years, and nothing done as yet, he went on repeating, and I was at last obliged to give him my hand in solemn pledge, that I would write something original before the end of the year—a promise that weighs heavily on me, as I have not the least desire to be an author."—Pp. 162, 163.

He was speedily, however, to be an author, and we soon find him engaged on his first great work, the Discourses on Religion. He is busy with these in 1799, transmitting portions from time to time for the perusal and criticism of Mrs. Herz, who, as well as Schlegel, was among the friends who now most directly stimulated and influenced his mind. The work referred to bears the title, *On Religion: Discourses addressed to the Educated among its Despisers*. We cannot more briefly or fairly characterize it than in the few sentences in which it is mentioned in the Introduction:

"In point of religion, Protestant Germany was, at that period, pretty equally divided between Rationalism, that had degenerated into religious indifference, and Supernaturalism, that had petrified into a lifeless, hereditary acquiescence in an historically transmitted faith. In his discourses Schleiermacher addressed himself principally to those who looked down upon religion as an antiquated prejudice, or at the highest as a crutch to prop up morality, and considered piety as the sign of a weak mind; but the boldness with which he set aside all mere traditional faith, and proved true religion to have its source in the innermost feelings and deepest instincts of man, was in a manner an indirect attack upon the other party also."—I. xv.

Some works of minor importance followed the Discourses; and in 1802 Schleiermacher accepted the office of Court preacher at Stolpe, in Pomerania. Here during two years he lived in comparative seclusion, striving latterly against his unfortunate attachment for the lady before named. Here, too, he completed the first volume of his *Plato*, and his *Critical Inquiry* into existing systems of Ethics. We find him also in the most friendly, and more than friendly, correspondence with Ehrenfried von Willich, and his young betrothed, Henrietta von Mühlenfels, destined later to become Schleiermacher's own wife. The letters



which pass between the three, like others in the volume, are couched in terms of affection so strong as will doubtless appear open to the charge of strange exaggeration, almost of untruthfulness, to a reader of cool English temperament; but we must remember the different genius and far more demonstrative tendencies, in such matters, of many of the continental peoples, including even the Germans. The letters referred to are quite in keeping with the whole cast of Schleiermacher's nature. Many of the German words and phrases of endearment in common use in the family circle, are apt to appear to the Englishman overwrought or half-ridiculous. That may, however, be *our* defect and loss as much as anything else.

Here we must stop for the present, observing only, in conclusion, that the translator has done her work with very laudable skill, so far as we can judge without having the original to refer to. Some faults we have observed, however: "my heart shall always *lay* open before you;" "opportunities of observing me *close by*" (p. 64); "*perfectionizing* yourself in mathematics" (p. 70);—such expressions are not to be classed among the elegances of the English language. Sometimes there is an evident want of correctness, or rather of fulness, in the rendering; as where Schleiermacher, writing in Berlin, says that a new career is opened to him there after his return *from Prussia*, meaning the province of East Prussia; and where he says, to account for his loss of time one day, that he had walked "*no less than a mile and a half*;" doubtless we should understand a German mile and a half, i.e. some *seven* English miles.

---

SCRIPTURAL HYMNS. BY SIR JOHN BOWRING.

No. XI.

"Forgetting those things which are behind" (Philip. iii. 13).

FORGETFUL of the things behind,  
 And pressing on to those before,  
 The inquiring and progressive mind  
 Turns history's teaching pages o'er,  
 To gather from the fleeting past  
 Substantial truths for time to come,  
 Holding the precious treasures fast  
 To guide our path and light our home.  
 For what is loving, right and true—  
 From dissolution and decay  
 Rescued—our pilgrim-journey thro'  
 Will fling its brightness on the way;  
 And while the sun from year to year  
 With his own living light may shine,  
 The ages as they disappear  
 Shall call forth glories more divine.

No. XII.

"My meditation of Him shall be sweet" (Ps. civ. 34).

SWEET shall be my meditation  
On the records of salvation—  
Not the songs which morning greet,  
    Music of the bees and birds,  
    All the eloquence of words,  
Are so sacred and so sweet.

Sweet shall be my meditation  
On the wonders of creation—  
Flowers beneath and stars above,  
    Flowing streams and waving woods,  
    Busy scenes and solitudes,  
All rejoicing in heaven's love.

Sweet shall be my meditation  
On the joy, the consolation,  
Which God's holy message brings  
    When entangled in the toils,  
    Treacheries, temptings and turmoils,  
Of the earth's perplexing things.

Sweet shall be my meditation  
Of that final consummation,  
When this earth's vicissitude  
    Shall depart with shade and sin,  
    And heaven's day unveiled begin,  
'Whelming all in light and good.

No. XIII.

"Let not the sun go down upon your wrath" (Eph. iv. 26).

LET not the sun go down upon thy wrath;  
Passion may move thee, but let sober thought  
Rule thee with influence more than passion hath,  
So by thy Saviour's gentle words be taught.

Let not the sun upon thy wrath go down,  
Leaving thee nought but darkness and its gloom,  
Thine own self-condemnation and the frown  
Of other judgments which are passion's doom.

Let not the sun go down upon thy wrath;  
Wrath is a whirlwind which tears up the roots  
Of kind affections, scattering on the path  
Evil and hatred and their bitterest fruits.

Let not the sun upon thy wrath go down:  
Thou know'st not what night's messages may be;  
For the cold, sudden tide of death may drown  
Every redeeming hope that smiled on thee.

## THE UNITARIAN CHURCH.

THE word Church, as used among Christians, has at least three different meanings. By *the* Christian Church, we understand all who acknowledge the divine authority of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. All consistent Protestants must admit the right of every Christian to worship his Maker in the manner which best approves itself to his conscience, and consequently that any number of Christians are at liberty to form a congregation for social worship and religious instruction. A congregation so formed becomes *a* Christian Church. These are the widest and the most restricted meanings of the word Church; but there is another and a very important sense of the word. The Roman Catholic Church (as it calls itself and is too often called by those who are aware of the inaccuracy of the title), indeed, considers itself as the only true Christian Church, and confines the benefits of Christianity to those within its pale. The Greek Church we believe to be in principle the same as the Roman, the dispute between them being which is the true Church. With Protestants the case is different. Inconsistent as the conduct is of nearly all Protestant Churches with the great principle of Protestantism, the right of private judgment, and fond as they have been of denouncing all who deny any of their doctrines or separate themselves from their communion as heretics and schismatics, they have hardly gone so far as to condemn in express terms all who do not belong to their communion. In the far larger number of Protestant countries a system of doctrine and of discipline has been established, which is considered to constitute the national Church. Such are the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, the Church of Sweden, &c. Let us now look to the state of the Dissenters in this country. All branches of Dissenters have their own organizations, and each sect has its particular name, more or less freedom of opinion being allowed among different sects, but all of them having something peculiar to themselves, some bond of union, without which it is obvious that they could not be held together. If a man profess himself a Quaker, a Baptist, an Independent or a Wesleyan, there must be some ground of his preference of the particular connection to which he belongs. If it were not so, the sect would inevitably soon fall to pieces. We will endeavour to shew presently how a want of some bond of union has operated in an important body of Dissenters.

We now proceed to consider the case of the Unitarian Church, as in propriety of language it ought to be called, although some, for reasons which we will endeavour to shew are insufficient, refuse to adopt the name.

That there are a great number of congregations in this country in which the form of worship is strictly Unitarian, is a fact which none can deny; and no one has suggested, to our knowledge, any



other bond of union among them than the profession of Unitarian opinions. Unitarian congregations are of two classes: first, those which have been formed expressly as Unitarian—Essex Street, Little Portland Street, Brighton, and we believe some others. The far larger part, however, consists of old Presbyterian congregations. Have these latter congregations any other bond of union than the profession of Unitarian opinions and the exclusive use of Unitarian forms of worship? If they have, we must confess ourselves ignorant what it is. Much, indeed, has been spoken and written about free inquiry in allusion to this subject, but we do not find that any one has distinctly said that free inquiry can be the bond of union by which religious societies are or can be held together. A Quaker and a Swedenborgian, a Calvinist and a Unitarian, a Deist, a Mormonite and an Atheist, may all profess and practise free inquiry; but no sane person could think of forming all these persons into one religious body. But many who are descended from Presbyterian ancestors have an affection for the name, and think, with reason, that the English Presbyterians have done good service to the cause of religious freedom and of religion generally. The name Presbyterian as applied to this body of religionists has always been a misnomer, as the Presbyterian discipline was never established among them. Their character from the first has been as completely congregational as that of the Independents; and, as to discipline, they appear to have been only marked by their rejection of episcopacy. They strictly adhered in their early history to the doctrines commonly called orthodox. The nonconformists of that day, with a very few exceptions, would have rejected with horror Arian or Unitarian doctrines; and Richard Baxter, a man never to be mentioned but with the highest respect, is recorded to have approved of the clause in the Toleration Act which excluded all who denied the Trinity from the benefit of the Act, and to have said that he would “tolerate only those who were tolerable.” The Presbyterian divines being the best educated and the most learned of the Dissenters, and being real lovers of truth and friends of free inquiry, many of them, at an early period after the Toleration Act, found it impossible to assent to all the doctrinal articles of the Established Church; and, pursuing their inquiries, Arianism, and afterwards Unitarianism, made great progress among them. The congregations could not be reasonably expected to travel at the same rate in the road of theological inquiry; and the necessary consequence was, that many of the ministers held one set of opinions, while their hearers for the most part held another. This could not possibly last long; and it is no easy question to answer, what the conduct of the ministers ought to have been in such circumstances. They saw distinctly the absurdity of expecting unanimity on all the doctrinal matters contained in the Creeds and Articles of the Established Church; and they felt strongly that no set of fallible men had or

could have a right to enforce on others the reception of any creeds which they had made or adopted. They therefore wisely rejected subscription to any creed, and assumed to themselves the right to study the Scriptures in an independent spirit and to form their own opinions. At the same time, finding their hearers far behind them in what they conceived to be sound and enlightened views of Christianity, they had to consider what their congregations could bear, and to regulate their instruction accordingly. Whether they were justified in concealing their altered opinions from their congregations, is a question which we will not presume to decide. One of them, we know, fully declared his own opinions respecting the person of Christ.\* By renouncing creeds, however, and introducing no acknowledged bond of union in their place, they paved the way to their own destruction as a religious body; and few, we suppose, can now doubt that they would have entirely disappeared from the religious world if they had not embraced some distinct form of Christianity. This they have done, and the form is Unitarianism. Unitarianism has the advantage of requiring no creed, as its doctrines are the common doctrines of the Christian world, cleared of many of what are called orthodox dogmas. The worship of the one God and Father of all, without any distinction of persons, distinguishes it plainly and palpably from all other Churches; and, where a liturgy is used, the ground and basis of Unitarianism is shewn forth perspicuously. The rejection of the doctrine of the Trinity, indeed, is far from being the only distinction of Unitarians. Along with it and in consequence of it, they reject many opinions which they believe to be unfounded in scripture and to be inconsistent with just conceptions of the character of the Deity. No Unitarian holds the doctrine of Original Sin, or believes that Christ suffered to appease the vengeance of an angry God, which is called satisfying his justice. The Unitarian regards the Deity as one "whose tender mercies are over all his works," and "who sent his Son into the world to seek and to save that which was lost." These and the like sentiments they think fully sanctioned by our Saviour and his apostles, and they are in strict harmony with the doctrines of the ablest moral philosophers. Surely these are views of religion which we should endeavour to promote to the utmost of our power. We see no method so likely to effect this purpose as the cordial and earnest co-operation of all the congregations which we consider to form collectively the Unitarian Church. Every Unitarian congregation, indeed, is to be considered quite independent in the regulation of its own affairs; but the co-operation of the whole body for the purpose of promoting the views of religion which they profess, could hardly fail to produce very beneficial effects. We have already an important institution, the Unitarian Association; but their action might be greatly

---

\* Dr. Lardner, in his well-known *Four Sermons*.

extended if they were acknowledged as the representative body of the affiliated churches of the Unitarians. How can a reasonable person expect any considerable advance among us while we appear to the world so loosely attached to our religious opinions as to shrink from adopting the only name by which they are distinguished? Among the idlest fancies that the ever-active mind of man has engendered, is the notion that a generalized Christianity, which has no definite views, can be the means of keeping together a Christian congregation for any length of time. We have often heard it asserted, and we have no reason to doubt the truth of the assertion, that Dr. Abraham Rees never explained to his congregation his opinions of controverted points of religion, and the large congregation under his ministry remained in ignorance of his opinions till the time of his death. What was the consequence? Just what any rational person might have anticipated: a remnant of the congregation was kept together for a short time by Mr. Davison, and then it came to an end. When a Christian Dissenting congregation has no distinctive principle or set of opinions which holds them together, they can be united only by a regard to their minister and a preference of his preaching. One will be of Paul and another of Apollos; but when Paul and Apollos disappear, division, and very probably the dissolution of the congregation, will follow.

Let us now advert to the objections which have been made to the name Unitarian as distinctive of our religious connection. We must first, however, return our thanks to Mr. Martineau for his courteous answer to our inquiry into the meaning of a passage in his letter. We, indeed, greatly regret that he should have supposed that we charged him with inconsistency. It seemed, indeed, to us that the words used by him in their ordinary signification did involve an inconsistency, but we added, "we should gladly and gratefully receive such an explanation as would shew that Mr. Martineau's words were intended to express something different from what they seem to us to import;" and we added, "we are encouraged to believe that such explanation may be given," &c. The explanation has been given; it is satisfactory, and we are grateful for it. In this letter, Mr. Martineau says, "the question is not about the importance of this or that discriminative doctrine, but about the propriety of fixing *any* polemically-selected doctrine as the permanent essence of church-life." We confess ourselves not able clearly to see what is understood by church-life. If we are to understand it to mean "religious life," no Unitarian will be so presumptuous as to deny that Christians of pure and holy lives are to be found in all the churches and sects into which the Christian world is divided; but that that circumstance should prevent our calling ourselves by the name which expresses our principles and the form of worship which we practise, we cannot at all understand.



## CORRESPONDENCE.

## CRITICISMS ON THE NATIONAL REVIEWER.

SIR,

I AM desirous of being allowed a little space in your pages for a few observations on the letter in your January number of the Author of the Article on Ewald in the National Review, as I think it possible the notice I should take of it may be of rather different character from that of other correspondents who have already expressed or intend to give their criticisms, and may therefore still possess some interest for your readers; and to shew at once what statements in the letter of the reviewer I propose noticing, I will begin by quoting them, as both the best introduction for my remarks and as the necessary text to which I must refer for the comments I propose to offer.

"In Matthew we have probably the old Palestinian tradition regarding Jesus." Does this sentence mean that all the words, thoughts and actions related of Christ and others, and of the Divine purpose in him, are tradition, meaning such traditions as we know of in Christian and heathen records? "Between the line of thought in Matthew and that of Luke, written for a heathen convert, there is wide difference, implying considerable interval of time. The difference between John's and the three earlier Gospels proves it could not be written till the close of the first century, but of the greater Epistles of Paul there is no doubt. And there seems to me evidence that Christ's resurrection *or* ascension, whichever term we adopt (for both express the same mysterious fact, his passage from the present to the next life), were so witnessed to the minds of believers not through violations of natural law, but in virtue of deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and the unseen worlds, so as to convince them of the perpetuity of his existence and the reality of his occasional intercourse."

I quite agree with the reviewer that both the descriptions given in the historical books of our Saviour's appearances to his disciples after his death and resurrection, and the language of the Epistles when reasoning upon these great facts, are not consistent with the return of the risen Christ to all the conditions of the ordinary human life. I would particularly refer to the accounts of the appearance and disappearance of his presence or person as completely distinguished in the narrative from any conditions and possibilities of our natural bodies. And also to the language of St. Paul when he replied to the questioner, "With what body will the dead come?" "There is one glory of the terrestrial, one of the celestial; it is sown a natural, it is raised a spiritual body;" and to the rest of his argument on the resurrection and immortal life, as well as to that employed in 2 Cor. v., "Not that we would be unclothed, but we would be clothed upon with our dwelling which is from heaven." Taking together these strong evidences for the not literally human-conditioned body or existence in which after the resurrection Christ was manifested during his stay on earth, *what* it was his intention to declare in his own words to Mary, "Detain me not," &c.; to Thomas, "Thrust thy hand into the wound of my side;" to the rest, "Handle me, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me to have,"—after he, the doors being closed, stood in the midst of them,—seems to me best explained by the wise and searching words of St. Paul, "God giveth to every seed the body that pleaseth Him;" thus at once checking curiosity

and speculation, while giving the assurance to any timid fears, that even the body is not altogether dead, but that such a body as is adapted to the perfected life can be its dower there, as the earthly one has been to our life here.

It appears to me that the facts of Christ's renewed life were evidenced to the senses of the disciples in such a way as to make it the object of their clear and undoubting perception, so that their intellect might bear its full testimony in conjunction with the persuasion and true faith of the higher powers of their reason that "death could not hold him, that he is the first fruits of those that sleep, that in him all mankind will be made alive," but that the distinct character of this body, the exact nature of the heavenly dwelling, as not necessary because not practical for our knowledge while on earth, is not explained to us. For it seems natural that the kind of body in which the Christ appeared should not be made clear to us in the scripture narrative, since we know that we have no organs by which we could apprehend it without that perpetual miracle which such a change would render requisite, yet enough is told us to shew that the speculations which on the one hand tend to consider the body as the source of all evil, are as incorrect as on the other hand will prove those which would view it as the condition, if not the cause, of all good,—extremes which human thought has inclined towards at all ages of our human history, as it does at the present day.

But where the author proceeds to clothe his own view of the appearances of our Saviour to the disciples in such phrases as "a spiritual fact," a "reality made certain to a human soul not by the outward senses," the one statement appears to me contradictory to the other. A spiritual fact can only relate to the spirit, is purely internal, must be subjective, and has nothing to do with any external objective reality, nor consequently can affirm the existence of any other person, which is an objective proposition. So any direct communication of spiritual truth to human consciousness has no intelligible meaning. Consciousness implies the association, the application of mental, internal or subjective truth to some external objective phenomena, by which that which was before dark becomes light to us; and we see the objective phenomena by the subjective truth. But the terms, "a direct communication of spiritual truth," contain obviously no objective elements at all, and clearly therefore cannot be applied to our consciousness. "Unveiling the realities of the invisible world to the eye of the soul," should imply only an increase of internal truth to the mind, if by "invisible world" is meant the spiritual or mental world, not that which is only not seen by us, but is still objectively existent.

These positions or explanations of the reviewer appear also to be in opposition to that of his next sentence—"the effect on the apostles' minds requires the support of some presence assuring them that they in some way recognized Christ as a real person from the invisible world." This last proposition seems to agree perfectly well with the real statements and language of the New Testament, but to be quite distinct from a spiritual or internal fact or truth which is shewn to the inward eye of the soul.

Again, "that the resurrection of Christ was so witnessed to the minds of believers, not by the violation of any natural law, but in virtue of some deeper law affecting the relations of the seen and unseen worlds," seems to contain a not very intelligible statement of the author's mean-

ing; for the witnessing to the human mind of the resurrection by a deeper law affecting some unseen world, would of course in correct language be termed a miracle. It would not be a violation of Natural law, since that regulates or describes relations in the seen Natural world; for we must recollect that a law of Nature has no real existence, implies no necessity in Nature itself, but only signifies the mode in which our minds *must* think about Nature in order to understand her; but the impression by a higher than natural power of an objective or external phenomenon on a higher subjective state of the mind or sense than the human, at once takes us into another state, and we see that everything which happens, or, as the reviewer expresses it, "is witnessed to the human mind," by other than natural channels, is so effected by miracle. And doubtless this is what the reviewer means to express in employing such phrases as "lifting the veil," &c. The same attribute of miraculous will indeed equally apply to the interpretations which can be given by any theory of the appearances of the risen Saviour; for if we admit the intercourse of a higher world into our present, we admit necessarily the idea of miracle with it. The theory of a human body restored to life, but not the human life, requires the acceptance of a miracle for our belief; equally so does the theory which considers the risen and immortal body not as a human, but a glorified or more perfect body; equally so does the reviewer's, that it was "a living presence from the invisible world." All these forms of manifestation require a miracle to be witnessed to and apprehended by our natural human minds. We have no hesitation in believing that the reviewer will unite with the fullest cordiality in the truth of this position with those who hold other opinions on the mode of the resurrection. In the reviewer's estimate of the date at which the New Testament writings were composed, since he ranges the Gospels between the years A.C. 60 to 90, having allowed to St. Paul's Epistles the usual dates of from 50 to 60, the margin which he has thus left for the introduction of later opinions and new additions cannot be very large, if we consider the vast nature of the revelation contained in the message of any one of our Gospels, the variety and multiplicity as well as the depth and height of its subjects, and the difficulty of comprehending all its fulness by the human mind; so that instead of suggesting the imaginary hypothesis that the belief of twenty or thirty years would have necessarily added much development or new views to the gospel, we shall feel rather inclined to suppose that they would hardly have sufficed for the study of the whole as delivered, and that thus, instead of this great body of doctrine being increased and matured, every decade after the inspiration which introduced it had ended would have let slip some truth, dropped out some grains of the treasure of revelation entrusted to it, as we know was in reality the case during the centuries which immediately followed upon the teachings of Christ and his apostles. Such has been always the history of great religious movements. To take the most recent instances, no great changes occurred, certainly no improvements, in Wesley's doctrine during thirty years from the first great impulse he gave to religious feeling. Neither did our own view of Christian truth change from its fundamental ideas for a much longer space of time from its rise in England two centuries ago.

It would be of great interest if the reviewer had explained with some clearness what is the meaning of the assertions he makes of "the very different tone of thought and feeling between the several Gospels, implying progressive conception of the facts of Christ's history and of the fun-



damental ideas of his teaching, such as must have required a considerable lapse of time to account for," since the questions thus viewed are assuredly very important to the criticism and interpretation of the Gospels; and although the reviewer has spoken of such considerations being those a Unitarian minister will appreciate, though less intelligible to others who have not much exercised their minds with such inquiries, yet since Unitarians not in the ministry are much in the habit of studying the Gospels and comparing passage with passage, and as they are generally accustomed to consider these Gospels as speaking one language and declaring one truth, they will, I am sure, unite with me in earnestly hoping that the reviewer will bring forward the grounds for his opinions on so highly important a subject; for it is obvious that any theories regarding the details of the resurrection and the miracles may represent only the state of the writer's metaphysical and physical knowledge; but the question whether the facts of the Gospels are the Truth of a Revelation, or represent the "opinions" and the "traditions" of some men like ourselves, is one which affects so deeply every Unitarian that it should not be confined to the study of a Unitarian minister. The effect would surely have been very different to the science of history and the growth of the human mind, whether its students had had to fill their memories with the romances of Geoffrey of Monmouth, the fabliaux of the Table Ronde, or the Hindu epics and puranas, or if they can lay their foundations in the histories of Herodotus, Tacitus, Rapin, De Thou and Grote; and if this would be a vital question in our history of facts, how infinitely magnified becomes its importance when the choice is of results to be deduced from the thinking and imagining of a few human minds, and those uneducated ones, upon the Infinite, the Real and the True, or from the expressed communication of the Creator of all these to us concerning them and our relations with them. Perhaps from being less constantly occupied with the study of commentaries, the laity may bring a fresher and more acute perception to the judgment of questions so strikingly important and of a scale of magnitude which cannot be overlooked.

Again, I wish to refer to another apparent inconsistency in the method of argument adopted by the reviewer. Surely, if we suppose the New Testament writings merely the reports and thoughts of very fallible men, taking of course different views of their wide theme, committing many oversights, contradicting and altering each other's statements, and full of difficulties in their comprehension and application of the vast message they had received, the reviewer can lay no stress on any contradictions or divergences in them, and his whole theory, both of dates and of appearances, must totter to the ground. Neither can I understand how any other of his Scripture criticisms founded on internal evidence, i. e. on words, can have the least correctness or authority to allege in its favour, nor consequently how any important points in authenticity (and how important become any which rise above the most minute in the scale of the immortal and the infinite!) could be decided on such evidence. And we sweep away at once, with all power of proving, all the foundation of truth which we had sought and prayed for a Revelation to give us. Such criticism, founded upon the negation of all basis of truth, would seem as incongruous and vain a labour as does the opposite method employed by a respondent to the reviewer, who, asserting full belief in the authority and truth of the New Testament, cites

the false and unfulfilled Judaic expectations of the evangelist and apostle as proofs that the Gospel of St. Matthew and the Epistle of St. Paul must have been written at those early dates which would, it is obvious, have given their authors the fullest knowledge of the words and facts, or of the reality of what they have described.

Perhaps it would be of advantage, in our study of philosophic and mental questions, if we would accept the validity of this dictum, that the nearer the approach to truth in the premises, the greater unanimity will there be in the results deduced; while the less there is of truth in the premises, the more divergence and contradiction will assuredly present themselves in the conclusions.

THE AUTHOR OF "INSPIRATION, HOW RELATED TO REVELATION?"

### ON THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

SIR,

HAVING read the learned and elaborate discussions in the late Nos. of the *Christian Reformer* on the nature and form of the resurrection of Christ, it has occurred to me as rather singular that no reference has been made to Luke xxiv. 36—39, &c. Unless the authenticity of the statements contained in these verses could be impugned, they afford conclusive evidence of a bodily resurrection. Luke neither invented the narrative, nor did Christ represent an optical illusion as a substantive fact. The words "flesh and bones" were necessarily intended, and must have been understood by those who heard them, to signify a real human body.

*S. Petherton, Feb. 8, 1860.*

J. NICHOLETTES.

### REPORT OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

SIR,

I THINK I have observed of late years that the College Reports have been apt to branch out into dissertation and irrelevance. Such a tendency never speaks well for the institution they tell us of, and is quite alien from what a genuine report should be; viz., as its name implies, a simple account of what it relates to. That is all we want and look for. We make our own reflections. It is supplied to us for that very purpose. We may perhaps properly indulge the writer with a closing remark; but beyond this it is hazardous to go. And I fear the Report of Manchester New College, just issued, has incurred the risk. I fear, too, the incurring it has verged into what by some will be regarded as a degree of arrogation and obscurity. A more serious offence, in our eyes, is an approach to the blot of Mr. Kingsley's style so noticeably rebuked by the *National Review*, viz., the introduction of the Great Name in a way that hurts our religious sense. Rather lightly the reviewer says of him, "The expressions alluded to ('God's work,' 'God's feasts,' 'God's heroes') appear to be dictated by an appetite for strong language operating on a gentleman in orders; and are, in fact, we believe, Mr. Kingsley's way of swearing." I hope as a religious communion we may never be drawn into such phraseology. It will be a sign that our genuine religion is gone.

*Feb. 13, 1860.*

J. H. RYLAND.

## CRITICAL NOTICES.

*The Revelation of God and Man in the Son of God and the Son of Man: Six Sermons preached in Renshaw-Street Chapel, Liverpool.* By John Hamilton Thom. Pp. 142. London—Whitfield.

THIS valuable contribution to our theological literature is calculated to render excellent service in giving light to many now sitting painfully in the dark shadow of orthodoxy. Compact in form, striking in sentiment, devout in spirit, these Six Discourses contain a body of Christian doctrine well adapted for the relief of those who are thus suffering under the tenacious terrors of the popular creed, from which they have found no way to a purer and a more scriptural faith. We have reason to believe that in Mr. Thom's representation of the Unitarian doctrine two classes of minds will receive satisfaction, which divide perhaps almost equally between them the outer zone of the circle of exclusive churches. For neither heart nor intellect is truly at peace in Calvinism from the moment that they are suffered to put forth their natural testimony against it. In some persons who have been educated in that unnatural system of religious belief, the two phases of mental character unite; but their fear of losing in Unitarianism the heart's warm reverence for the Saviour keeps the intellectual doubt in suspense. To the honest inquirer of this order, the views of the present work will be especially welcome. It is markedly liberal, while yet distinctively Christian. It is not necessary to say that all Unitarians agree with every point in the theology of this work. We are sure that they do not. Different views might easily be collected from our various writers in regard to several of the most important topics upon which these Discourses dwell. We may not all assent to the idea of the gospel miracles here exhibited, nor to that of the action of the Divine Spirit within the soul of universal man, nor even to much that is here said respecting the representative and ideal manhood of Jesus. No man has yet been authorized, nor any body of men, to declare the law of Unitarian freedom or limitation in religious belief, though we do not differ from each other in anything like the proportion of diverse Evangelical interpretations of what they affect to designate the same fundamental doctrines. But however variously regarded among ourselves, as they may legitimately be, the views presented in this work will favour its influence, as we believe and trust, in the direction just indicated. We know of how small use it would be to commend the volume before us to the condescending notice of some who exalt themselves by reviling others, and who might learn with sorrow in how earnest and devout a form the most thorough Humanitarian doctrine may admit of being clothed; but we are of opinion that very many who rank amongst the orthodox would receive with gratitude the knowledge of Unitarianism after the manner in which Mr. Thom so strikingly, with mingled elegance and force of thought, presents it. They are held back from our profession by an ungrounded fear of falling into universal scepticism if they remove from their position in the established churches. They cannot reconcile the liberty of religious thought with discipleship in Christ. They are assailed on all hands with the question as to where their doubts will



stop. They do not perceive that these honest doubts arise upon the ground of the sincere faith in God and in moral truth which they, in common with us, already securely hold. They may study with comfort such a passage as the following, which lays down the proper basis of Christian union in full consistency with the utmost rights of free human thought :

"It is usual to have ascribed to us, and occasionally by some of ourselves, that ours is a negative Christianity. They who speak thus, speak in rashness and in ignorance. Is God manifest in the flesh, a negative confession of Christian Faith? Is the Word made flesh and dwelling amongst us, recognized as the normal condition of Human Nature, a negative profession of Christian Duty?"—P. 76.

"I shall be told that this is the end and aim of *all* Christian Churches—that this is no peculiarity of ours—that never did a Christian Church exist, that would not define, and find, its central life in the purpose to develop in Human Nature the Image of God given to us in the Man Christ Jesus. *This is so.* Christ is *not* divided. This is the common ground of Christian union. All Christendom agrees in this, that God reveals His Son in us in order that in each soul of Man the same Image of the Father may come into full lineament and life. *This is no peculiarity of ours:* in this we are differenced from no other Christian Church,—and no other Christian Church is differenced from us. What then *is* our peculiarity? This simply: that we take this, this ground on which we do *not* differ from the rest of Christendom, *for the whole of the Christian peculiarity*,—that we suffer nothing more than this to enter into the definition of Christianity, or into the constitution of a Christian Church. Our peculiarity is this, that taking it as our aim to grow in the likeness of God after the Image of Himself He has given us in the Man Christ Jesus, we pursue that aim under the *conditions* of absolute *Liberty* as to the views of God and of his Providence that may individually commend themselves to us, and by *means* of simple allegiance to our own convictions of Truth as God may shew it to us: *our object*, the Image of God, to have Christ formed within us: the *conditions*, freedom to receive help and light from the Source of all grace and knowledge: the *means*, personal fidelity to the light given to each one of us. Now all Christian Churches agree with us in our *object*, the reproduction in each of the Image of God as Christ has shewn it to us—and all *real* members of those Churches agree with us as to the *means*, personal fidelity to our own Truth, to our own best conceptions of God and of His relations to Human Nature; but *we* stand alone as to the individual mental *conditions* under which this aim is to be pursued, these means employed,—absolute Liberty, a Liberty never shortened, never bound, never closed, to receive whatever fresh light God may give us, and to expect new light for ever upon His Being, His Providence, His Grace, His methods of applying that Grace, His personal relations to the human spirit, the mysteries of His infinite Nature. Upon these subjects we dare make *no Articles of Religion*; in these directions we dare not *define* the manifold immensity of God. To believe that God is the Father of every human spirit,—and that Jesus Christ is the fullest likeness to God that Human Nature can exhibit, the pattern of all our divine destiny up to the entrance on Heavenly life,—we dare make nothing else essential to our Christianity. Other Churches recognizing the same object, employing the same means, may grow in the Christian life, though in all other respects their views of the theory of Religion are different from ours; but if they grow, it is because they *do* employ the same means, absolute fidelity of confession and of life to their own spiritual perceptions of God."—Pp. 77—79.

We notice further in these Sermons a point of particular interest at the present time. There are persons who conceive so meanly of human

nature as to think that it cannot, by any given measure of divine grace, exhibit the perfect moral likeness of God. Jesus therefore must have been of another nature before he appeared invested with the conditions of humanity. As man, his being was not sufficiently mystical, they think, to justify the strong figurative language of certain portions of the New Testament description. There is a painful craving for something more unintelligible than what is called the bald Unitarian doctrine. These Discourses do not palter with this morbid tendency. Not only do they speak of the Saviour in his perfect manhood, precisely in the manner of the Scriptures, but they insist, with unanswerable force, upon this conception of him in its simplicity as an essential element in the doctrine of the gospel. Mr. Thom does not maintain this point of the strict humanity of Jesus incidentally, or as though it offered a mere happy coincidence with all the other judgments of a liberal creed. He dwells upon the fact with an emphasis which discovers his own deep sense of its religious value. It is one base of his whole superstructure of theological doctrine. It is among the roots of his devotional sentiment. And the doctrine is seen to be of a character which, thus held, is unassailable. Either his theology is altogether at fault, or it must stand upon this support in "the Mediator, the *man* Christ Jesus." Considering how strongly Mr. Thom brings to view the divine side of the life and character of Jesus, the reader will perceive with what force his description of the Man of Sorrows is made, of whose divineness his humanity is constituted the obvious and necessary basis. With one slight exception which might be taken to the employment of the term "permitting" as applied to anything which man may do in relation to the Almighty, we quote with pleasure the following :

"But if Christ did not suffer as Man, if the Atonement he effected, meaning by Atonement the oneness of his Will with the Will of his Father, was wrought out not by Man permitting God to inspire and hold him up, but by the strength and inspiration of an Archangel or of an Eternal Son, then, setting aside all physical or metaphysical difficulties, why was he tried by the measure of *our* trials—how were our sufferings and difficulties an ordeal for *him*—why were not his temptations commensurate with his Nature—what is the moral value to us of a victory in which the tasks *remain* only human, whilst the strength brought to meet them is inaccessible and superhuman—or how is it that in dealing with the things of the Spirit, the things of absolute reality and truth, we can suppose that the Revelation of God would exhort us to seek help from the Throne of Grace in the times of our need because of One who felt our infirmities and knew our temptations and passed sinless through them, if that One was only to outward appearance placed in a human condition, but all the while with weapons that belonged only to a celestial armoury, and a spirit that had walked the courts above, concealed beneath the robes of his flesh? What encouragement could it give *us* to be confident of strength, if we will look for it to God, that an Archangel or an Eternal Son conquered here in our poor conflicts of the earth—or how could the Author and Finisher of our Faith exhibit the possibilities of *our* Nature on a Nature that is loftier than is ours? No one but a Man can feel as a Man feels them the infirmities of a Man; no one but a Man can know the temptations of a Man,—and that One who was not a Man, weighed upon only by our burdens, exposed only to our temptations, was without failure of trust or strength, is no more a revelation of human capability, no more an earnest of human salvation, no more a warrant for the Father's invitation to walk in the same steps, and take up the same cross, and arm ourselves with the same mind, and put on the Lord Jesus, than the vision of an Archangel who lives and has ever lived in the light of

Heaven, and veils his face before the Throne, would be a just measure for the faith of mortal men. Is it in this way that the God of Truth deals with us? Alas! how unreal must we ourselves have first become, how shadowy and scenical in our ways of looking at the Revelations of God, how far removed from the childlike faith that the things of our experience are the things of His Spirit, before we could believe it!"—Pp. 40—42.

Other remarks on, and other extracts from, this admirable volume we must postpone to our next number.

*Children of other Lands.* Groombridge and Co.

THIS little book contains "Fridolia and Babeli" (a Swiss tale); "Meek-eye, or the Ship of the Desert" (an Arabian Night's adventure); "The Box of Bonbons" (a French tale); "Ivan's Dream" (a tale of Siberia); "The Forest Festival" (a sketch of German life); and "The Lost Slipper" (a Turkish tale). These attractive titles are fully borne out by their interesting narratives. They teach by example, and shew to our young people of England that goodness and virtue and the true religion of the heart may be found in all countries, as well as youthful faults and failings. We recommend them to our young friends, and to many too who are beyond childhood.

*Life at Threescore.* By Albert Barnes. Philadelphia. 1859.

THIS is a delightful autobiographical sketch by a Christian man approaching his grand climacteric. We shall be disappointed if we cannot ere long describe its principal features to our readers. The man who is at sixty "hopeful in regard to the world, to truth, to religion, to liberty, to the advancement of his race," and who believes that "the world is growing better, not worse," is a witness whose evidence all good men will wish to hear in detail.

*A Day Out: a Summer Ramble in Daisy Nook.* By Benjamin Brierley. Pp. 64. Manchester—Kelly.

IF amongst our readers there are any that understand and relish the fine Doric of the Lancashire dialect and the sterling qualities of the Lancashire character, let them read this remarkable little book, in which they will find much humour, some wit, an eye for the beautiful in nature, and a heart that warms towards what is good and noble in the human character. It is the production of an operative in a cotton factory, and is creditable alike to his head and heart.

*Rights and Condition of Women.* By the Rev. Samuel J. May, of Syracuse, New York. Reprinted from the Fourth American Edition. London—Whitfield.

WE doubt whether a sermon is a convenient shape wherein to mould the discussion of a great social question like that of the Rights and Condition of Women. Still we recommend all who take an interest in the subject to read Mr. May's sermon. It does not exhaust the subject, but it treats parts of it very ably. This we say without professing agreement with all his conclusions.



## INTELLIGENCE.

### UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

The annual public examination of the students of this very useful institution took place at Manchester on Monday, Jan. 23rd, and two following days. In addition to the Tutors, there were official examiners appointed, viz., Rev. Dr. Hutton, Rev. Henry Green and Rev. Russell Carpenter. On the first day, Rev. W. Gaskell examined the classes in the Greek Language, Grecian History and English Language; and Dr. Beard the classes in Ecclesiastical History and the Geography of Palestine. On Tuesday, Mr. H. A. Bright conducted an examination on the Theology of the Unitarian Church. Dr. Beard examined the class in the Old Testament Theology in the book of Job, and Rev. J. H. Hutton examined the class in Political Economy. On the third day, Dr. Beard renewed the examination in Old Testament Theology, the subject being the Pentateuch; he also took the class in Christian Oratory, and examined them on Chrysostom and on the general subject of the composition of sermons; and the class in Hebrew Archæology, the topics selected being the origin, spirit, mission and literary products of the Hebrew nation. The examination was attended by a succession of visitors, who, we are informed, appeared much interested in the work and gratified by the results. We regret that we cannot give our own personal impressions, having been unexpectedly prevented from attending the examination. But the impression made on one of the examiners, the Rev. Henry Green, will be gathered from the following extracts from an address read by him at the close of the examination:

"I have listened with attention to the papers which have been read, examined many that had been written, and marked the progress of the *vivâ-voce* questionings and answerings as they have taken place. I may therefore be qualified in some degree to state the impressions on my own mind, and to give the assurance, as I do most heartily, of the satisfaction it has been to me to note the extent of the theological information which the lectures of the Tutors cover, and the earnestness and success with which the missionary students have made that information their own inalienable possession, a freehold for their lives.

"The original language of the Christian Scriptures,—the geography and natural history of Palestine,—the parentage, grammatical structure and rich literature of our

native English,—the sources, province and special relations of Ecclesiastical History,—and those glorious developments of human mental power which Greece achieved and beyond which we have not yet advanced,—these were the subjects to which I was glad to be a listener on our first day's examination. Some of them must have presented considerable difficulties to young men whose previous training had not prepared them for critical or theological studies; but it was evident that the harness had been put on with a resolute spirit, and that the work was done with a determination to become evangelists who could rightly divide the word of divine truth. . . .

"The second day's work was mainly occupied with the examination on the 'Theology of the Unitarian Church,' for the purpose of deciding the prize so liberally and thoughtfully offered by Mr. H. A. Bright, of Liverpool. I know not why our theology should to so great a degree be regarded as the domain, the deer-park or the pheasant-ground of exclusive teachers, where only the professional theologian is to go stalking along and holding his murderous battues; sure I am the church must be in a sounder state when its educated lay members become masters of its great doctrines and principles, and both direct by their knowledge and cheer by their presence and encouragement the students of divinity at their toil. Honour to the men among us who,

'Not seeking in the school of pride  
For precepts over dignified,'

gather here to shew that they esteem for their very work's sake the learners and scholars who are destined to become the missionaries of our faith! I would that others also came to this school of our future prophets, and by the kindly word and loving work raised and sustained our minds. The results of the competition I leave Mr. Bright to announce.

"Political Economy in lectures by Rev. Joseph H. Hutton, whose absence we regret and whose character we admire, was the next theme, and my notes tell me, if my memory fails, how clear and forcible were many of the papers read. Political Economy for missionary students?—the science of national wealth for those who are to set forth a world's salvation? And why not? Is there a better mental exercise, or in the compass of human knowledge one branch of study which in its true bearings, as pointing out the way to the highest well-being of the social com-

monwealth, can so directly prepare the mind for advocating on just principles what will promote a nation's progress in sound morals? In this view Political Economy is well introduced among the studies of the students of the Missionary Board.

"If to announce work without stint is to announce good tidings, this third day's labour has verily been a gospel of work. An iron man with an iron will and three-fold brass around him surely devised that from nine to one and from three to five, during six mortal hours as registered by Shrewsbury clock, the sons of Atlas should emulate their sire and bear on their shoulders the Old Testament theology of the Pentateuch, Hebrew archæology and English literature, the Christian oratory of him of the golden mouth, senior and middle Greek, the composition of sermons, and the literary products of the Hebrew nation. But so it is; the burden has been borne; and here we are sitting or standing at our ease, and rejoicing that we neither shrunk from the effort nor fainted by the way. Be assured the effort itself is a training of no mean value; and when the examinations of this third day are characterized as they deserve, that effort must appear as bestowed upon some of the highest literary preparations that the missionary of divine truth requires. . .

"As far as language can train the mind, our native English is no mean discipline for extending and enlarging its powers. Pursued with the purpose of ascertaining its forms, changes and alliances, what was its original stock, and how in virtue of conquests as well as of external influences it has been modified and improved, the study of the English language calls for distinctions almost as subtle and reasonings as acute as those which the Greek and Roman tongues demand. This study has too a special superiority; it leads us to the very shrines of our English thought, where we see how they grew and were modified and took the wings that tire not with the flow of time. There is probably no little waste of mental power when languages foreign to our infancy occupy the best years of life; and therefore when the mind has become to a considerable degree matured, as in the case of the young men of the Missionary Board, their own language is the proper one for peculiar attention; and if they put it into the crucible and apply the tests of observation and reasoning, and note how a noble literature has grown from the forests and marshes of the old Germany and Friesland, till its fruits are for nurture to the religion and the freedom of the world, I am persuaded we

shall conclude the Englishman's best study is the English language, and the preacher's great help for developing and enforcing truth a loving reverence for the great masters of the English tongue. . . .

"In conclusion, I must invoke the aid of a great master of practical wisdom, who taught mankind to aim at putting the square peg into the square hole, and to fill a circular cavity with a circular block. Nearly sixty years ago, when this old mortality of mine was young, he gave forth elementary sketches of Moral Philosophy, and in one of them treats of the Conduct of the Understanding. Truth he speaks of as the food for our soul's growth, as something like the Persian fire upon the mountains that goeth not out day nor night, and he sums up in these glowing words: 'Therefore if any young man here has embarked his life in pursuit of knowledge, let him go on without doubting or fearing the event,—let him not be intimidated by the cheerless beginnings of knowledge, by the darkness from which she springs, by the difficulties which hover around her, by the wretched habitations in which she dwells, by the want and sorrow which sometimes journey in her train; but let him ever follow her as the angel that guards him and as the genius of his life. She will bring him out at last into the light of day, and exhibit him to the world comprehensive in acquirements, fertile in resources, rich in imagination, strong in reasoning, prudent and powerful above his fellows in all the relations and in all the offices of life.' Noble words, are they-not? from that true friend of knowledge and freedom for the soul, Sydney Smith! May they be fulfilled in the experience of the young men whom I have had the honour of listening to at these examinations of the Unitarian Missionary Board; and as you, my auditors, bear them in mind, may they cover, what I am conscious is in this address, 'a multitude of sins'!"

We are able to give a copy of the questions on the Theology of the Unitarian Church, prepared by Mr. Bright himself, who generously offered the prize for the successful student.

"1. Explain the word 'Faith,' as it occurs in the New Testament. 2. Shew the distinction between the Sabellian theory and the belief that our Heavenly Father has given us three revelations of himself,—through Creation, through Christ, and through the Holy Spirit. 3. Give, according to the best authorities, the chronological order of the books in the New Testament, and the leading characteristics of their authors. 4. In what way have several eminent Unitarians en-

deavoured to reconcile a belief in the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost with their belief in the absolute Unity of God? And give your views on this question. 5. Quote the Proem of St. John's Gospel, and shew that any Trinitarian interpretation is inconsistent in itself. 6. Shew the fallacy of the chief Trinitarian arguments founded on the Old Testament. 7. Mention the different forms of Church government which, at various times, have existed in the Unitarian Church, and what you conceive to be the advantages of each. 8. What is the Unitarian view of the Christian Sacraments? 9. Shew that the orthodox doctrine of Original Sin is opposed to the teachings both of Nature and of Christ. 10. By what means can the Theology of the Unitarian Church in England be brought to bear more widely upon the people?"

The prize was gained by Mr. J. C. Street; and we cannot do better than offer a corrected report of the remarks made by the donor of the prize on presenting it to the successful candidate.

Mr. HENRY A. BRIGHT, of Liverpool, then stepped forward, and in presenting his prize to Mr. James Street for the best paper on the "Theology of the Unitarian Church," spoke as follows:—I have the greatest pleasure, Mr. Street, in begging your acceptance of these volumes—Conybeare and Howson, Stanley and Jowett. Your papers on the "Theology of the Unitarian Church" seem to me admirable. Your answer to the last question, how our theology might be brought to bear upon the people, I will venture to retain for myself. I hope that these volumes may be of some value to you. I hope that they will enable you to see how far our views have tempered other churches, and aid you in understanding the Apostle of the Gentiles. I have, by the leave of the institution, been allowed to offer a prize for next year on the "Ecclesiastical History of the Unitarian Church;" and allow me to say that, while thanking Mr. Green for the kind words he has spoken of me, I consider that I, as a member of the Unitarian church, bound up heart and soul in it, am doing no more than a simple duty, and one from which I cannot shrink. I believe that when I am doing my utmost I am but doing my simple duty as a layman of the church. Perhaps I may say a few words as to what I mean by the ecclesiastical history of the Unitarian church, and why I conceive it to be a question of very great importance; and should I, by any unfortunate accident, say one word to wound any one in anything I am about to say, believe me that such a word is entirely

unintentional. Of course, in expressing my own opinions strongly—for I hold them very firmly—I must expose every now and then what I believe to be fallacies; but I never willingly wound or hurt any one who holds opposite opinions. With regard to the Unitarian church, allow me to say that I hold that there is an invisible church of God, composed of good and holy men of all churches, of all creeds, of all theologies, and of those who have no theology at all. I do believe, with Matthew Arnold, that there are "children of a second birth whom the world cannot tame." And if I may venture to quote his words farther I would say,—

"Christian or Pagan, king or slave,  
Soldier or anchorite,—  
Distinctions we esteem so grave  
Are nothing in their sight;  
They do not ask, who pined unseen,  
Who was on action hurled,—  
Whose one bond is that all have been  
Unspotted by the world."

I believe that, beyond the invisible church, there is a Christian church, founded on earth by our Lord Christ, and of which he is the Leader in heaven. I believe that there is one flock and one Master, and that all who call themselves by the Christian name belong to him. But I hold this likewise, that in the great Christian army—it is done by the will of God—there are many regiments. In the Christian church there are various denominations or churches, and I will not shrink from my definite church where God has placed me—I will not move away from that regiment to which Christ has called me. And therefore it is that while I believe it my business to make myself a member of the invisible church of God, while I believe it my business to make myself a worthy member of the church of Christ, I must do my duty also in the regiment to which Christ has called me, the Unitarian church. I cannot see how or where the harm of this can lie. I cannot understand why, to take an analogous case, I may not be patriotic, because all men are my brothers. I am unable to understand why I may not be peculiarly attached to my own family, because I belong to the general family of man. Therefore I cannot understand why I am not to do my best for the peculiar household of faith in which I am placed. This feeling of love for my own church does not prevent me from appreciating others. Among my own truest friends are clergymen of the Churches of England and Rome. I value them, and they value me, because we feel that we are earnestly doing our best for the several churches to which we belong.



It is our want of earnest striving for our church that makes Unitarianism so unpopular. You may trace this in all our opponents' attacks. Thus Isaac Taylor infers we are mere dilettanti, who do not seem to care about one thing or the other. I believe that this church life requires encouragement. We must do more for it than we have yet done. The absence of it has made many of our best families leave us. Some thirty of my own relatives have gone over in my own time to the Church of England, and most of them because there was so little church life among ourselves. The knowledge of this want is springing up not only here but in America. When I first read the writings of Sylvester Judd, I found that he was calling up feelings which were my own. And Dr. Bellows is endeavouring to build up the Americans into a definite church. How is this end best to be promoted? I agree entirely with something that fell from Mr. Street yesterday, that it is not to be done by controversy, for controversy is a state of war, and a church can be up-built by only the arts of peace. Controversy is often necessary; but with great grief I have often seen able ministers going forth spending their strength upon some matter of controversy, coming back weary and worn, bringing little fruit. I have thought that if they had spent that time in catechetical teaching or pastoral visitation, they would have been doing a greater work. I must say that I know of nothing more important for the building up of this church feeling than a knowledge of the ecclesiastical history of our church. Mr. Bright proceeded to relate a personal anecdote to shew the benefits which he had derived from church history. When a boy at Rugby, all his fellow-scholars were about to be confirmed, and the head master, now Bishop of London, sent for him and urged him to be confirmed likewise. He was very miserable in his isolation, but turned to see what light he could derive from the history of the church, and then he saw how people had been tempted and persecuted on account of the principles which he held, and he gained strength sufficient to say that he would not be confirmed. Such, said he, would ecclesiastical history do for many of the younger members of our church. One circumstance of importance in connection with ecclesiastical history is, that it gives not only the history of sects, but also of the development of doctrine. This is a matter of importance. I do not think that the Unitarian church has fully developed out into what it will become. I do not believe that we have exhausted all the light; and while clinging most distinctly

to the words "Christian" and "Unitarian," as meaning the unity of God and the spiritual lordship of Christ, I believe that more truth is yet to come, and that having planted those truths deeply into the earth, we may advance to something higher and better. But I wish to guard myself on this ground. I have often heard the idea of progress dwelt on—I prefer development—for progress gives me the idea of a constant movement and shifting,—a dropping of what we do possess, while grasping for something we do not possess. I have observed that the disciples of progress often leave one Christian truth after another, till they become stranded on a barren Deism. The disciples of progress have been among the worst enemies of Unitarianism. I am a disciple of development; and I believe that the doctrines of the Unity of God and the Messiahship of Christ will flourish, grow up, bud and blossom, in a way which we have never yet seen. I believe that, keeping, as it were, the centre nave of the Unitarian church untouched, we may build cloister and tower and buttress around it, so that the Unitarian church shall become a glorious church, with its doors ever open for the poor, and so beautiful that the richest and noblest will gladly worship there,—a church which will speak of the heaven which is to be, and the glory of Christ in whose honour it was erected.

The general distribution of prizes followed. Rev. Dr. Beard performed this task with expressed and evident pleasure. Of the prizes for proficiency in Biblical History, Geography and Antiquities, liberally offered by Samuel Sharpe, Esq., of London, the first (consisting of books of the value of £3) was awarded to Mr. J. C. Street, and the second to Mr. C. T. Biss. To Messrs. M'Master and W. Robinson, copies of Mr. Sharpe's History of Egypt were given. The names of Messrs. Oates, Robinson and Willicote were also mentioned with honour. Certificates were then publicly given to the three students who had completed their course, viz., Messrs. Street, Robinson and Biss. A brief address from Dr. Beard followed, and the proceedings closed with a prayer by Rev. R. L. Carpenter. The same evening there was conducted in Cross-Street chapel a dedicatory service for the special benefit of students about to undertake pastoral or missionary offices. A large and highly respectable congregation, including many ministers of our church, attended. The introductory and devotional service was impressively conducted by Rev. S. A. Steinthal, of Liverpool, and the address of dedication was delivered to a deeply

attentive congregation by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, of Hackney. By the desire of the Committee of the Home Missionary Board and of all the students of the institution, the address will be printed, and will appear in the next number of our Magazine.

Not the least interesting part of the examination proceedings to the Unitarian public of Manchester is the annual *soirée*, which this year was held in the Town Hall on the evening of Tuesday, Jan. 24. It was well attended by Unitarian friends drawn from a wide circle around Manchester, and admirably conducted from first to last. We have been supplied with a very full report of the speeches delivered on the occasion, and only regret that we cannot possibly find room for all of them. The chair was taken and its duties excellently performed by J. C. Lawrence, Esq., of London. The speakers were, in addition to the Chairman, Rev. J. T. Whitehead, the Mayor of Manchester, Henry A. Bright, Esq., Rev. Charles Beard, Rev. W. Gaskell, Rev. Brooke Herford, Samuel Greg, Esq., Rev. R. L. Carpenter, Rev. Henry Green, Rev. John Wright, R. Taylor Heape, Esq., Rev. James Drummond and Rev. J. C. Street.

Before giving any of the addresses, we prefix the substance of the Committee's report, which was presented by Rev. James T. Whitehead. It was in its general character cheering and hopeful, and pointed to the results which ensued from the establishment of the College. How far the present widely-spread missionary movement was due to the efforts and influence of the Board would be left for others to determine; but it could at least claim a share in the advantages likely to be derived from the newly-aroused enthusiasm, since without the education provided by it no scheme of missionary labour could be regarded as complete. The report then shewed the stations of all the students who had left the Board. Of these gentlemen, seventeen in all, nine were either missionaries or ministers of societies recently established. The report gave a detailed account of the public work done by the students during the last year, shewing the number of places preached at, the Sunday-school services and addresses, the visits to the sick, &c. &c. One fact shewn in the report was, that frequently students had to conduct services on the same day in places many miles distant; this displayed the insufficiency of the present number of students to do the work. To obviate this difficulty, the Committee hoped that a knowledge of the nature and objects of the Board would be more extensively diffused

among young men desirous of engaging in the gospel work. The number of students for the year now closed had been thirteen, three of whom, Messrs. W. Robinson, C. F. Biss and James C. Street, had now completed their course. Mr. Street had accepted an invitation from the Committee of the Manchester District Unitarian Association to become their missionary, and Mr. W. Robinson had been appointed missionary of the East Lancashire Association. Mr. Biss had not yet obtained an appointment. Messrs. Timmins and Whitworth had successfully passed the entrance examinations, and had been entered as students for the ensuing year. The Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., had resigned the office of superintendent missionary, and the Revds. John Wright, B.A., and B. Herford had consented to share the duties until a successor could be appointed. Donations of books had been received from various friends during the year. The Committee regretted to add that the Treasurer's account again shewed an excess of expenditure above income, in spite of every effort to avoid unnecessary expense. They would express an earnest hope that the efforts of the Board might not be crippled for the sake of two or three hundred pounds yearly.

Mr. WADSWORTH then read the Treasurer's report, which shewed an income of about £800, against an expenditure of about £1050.

The CHAIRMAN said that the object of the Home Missionary Board was to educate young men for the purpose of becoming missionaries to both town and country. At its commencement fears had been expressed that it would interfere with older institutions, but time had, he believed, dissipated those fears, and the result had shewn that there was a great field which might be usefully occupied by the Home Missionary Board. When he surveyed that field he was struck with the vastness of its extent compared with the smallness of our means. He hoped that the result of this and other similar meetings would be to increase those means. A growing conviction was taking place among thoughtful men that if the great outlying masses of the people should ever be brought under the influence of Christianity, it must be by other instrumentalities than those which supply the wants of cultivated congregations, and of persons who had received early religious training. No one could regard the present aspect of society without feeling that a deep responsibility rested on all who valued their Christian privileges. He trusted that there would be an increased desire on the part of Christian professors to extend the principles which they held so dear. It

could be done only by sending the gospel to the homes of the poor. The work being done by this institution should, he thought, have been done long ago, but it was not too late to begin; and he trusted that the members of our churches would not rest satisfied with sending others to do the work, but would engage in it themselves so far as practicable. Each person could find in his own locality some missionary work which he should do personally. He knew of no greater work. It might be true that there was great satisfaction in commercial enterprise, there was delight in scientific research, but he knew of no joy, no satisfaction, comparable with that of the feeling which sprung up in the mind conscious of influencing mankind for good, conscious of being instrumental in reclaiming men from sin, and bringing back the wandering child to his Heavenly Father. He hoped that this institution would receive increased support, which could not any longer be withheld on the ground of commercial depression. He trusted that those who shared in the present prosperity would remember that they are but stewards of God's bounty, and that they would shew their gratitude to Him by extending as far as they could blessings to those around them.

IVIE MACKIE, Esq., moved the adoption of the report. He had pleasure in stating that the balance-sheet of the Home Missionary Board was the only one with which he was connected which did not shew the balance on the right side. He quite agreed with some remarks made by the Chairman about the relation between the present commercial prosperity and the funds of the Board. Manchester was never in such a flourishing state, and it would be a shame if such an institution as this were not properly supported. When it was established five years ago, he had doubts of its success; but his confidence in it had increased every year, and he now looked upon it as one of our established institutions, and one of our best, for it possessed more life and energy than any other. He was glad to think its students and professors were closely united, and that the former in consequence had made much progress. The professors taught the students what they believed to be true, giving the students liberty to exercise their own judgment. In no place was there more liberty than here. The only want was that of money, which he thought would be easy to get. The former students had all turned out satisfactorily, and were doing much to spread our noble principles. A Church-of-England clergyman in Liverpool the other day, speaking in his sermon of Unitarians, said that they were a much

maligned body and utterly undeserving of the treatment which they usually received. "We are all," said he, "Unitarians; or if we are not, we ought to be." He (the Mayor) had had the fact from one of the clergyman's hearers. He had spent the evening with that clergyman and found him to be really a Unitarian, though professedly a member of the Establishment. After an appeal for funds, the Mayor resumed his seat.

Mr. H. A. BRIGHT, of Liverpool, on seconding the motion, said—I regret that the Committee of the Unitarian Home Missionary Board have been so unkind to you as to ask me to second the resolution. But I am glad that it gives me one more opportunity of publicly identifying myself with Unitarian Christianity on the one hand, and missionary action on the other; and thus identifying myself with the Unitarian Home Missionary Board, which unites those two principles. I believe that this Board is doing a great work and meeting a great want, and I believe that it is chiefly owing to it that the Provincial Assembly has been enabled to take up those plans of missionary action which, I believe, will transform the position of our church in Lancashire and Cheshire, and place it where it ought to be—foremost. I know that objections are being constantly made to the Board. I know, of course, that those objections have been uprooted and weeded out time after time, but I know also that every season there springs up a fresh crop of those chickweeds and groundels, and so I must spend a moment or two in endeavouring to answer those objections, and shewing why I have confidence in the Unitarian Home Missionary Board. And first, there is what I may call the aristocratic objection to it. It usually takes the form that our body or denomination—for these objectors never use the word "church," but "our body"—has a mission—that is always the word—and this mission is to leaven other denominations, but to leave the poor alone. We are to *leaven* others and subscribe something to a universal church of the future, which may take place or may not, but we shall then have done our work and must die out. But for my part, I very much object to dying out. And I am selfish enough to prefer building a house for myself, to subscribing bricks for somebody else to build a house for himself. And this at least is not selfishness when I say that we are behaving extremely ill, if when the poor man comes to us and asks for the bread of life, and that he may put on the robes of life, we tell him to be clothed and fed elsewhere. When we say



that, we are denying the first principles of Christian truth, and proving as false to our Master as we possibly can. These objectors are taking up ground which has been occupied once and again, and as often abandoned as of no value. They are taking up the ground of the early Platonists. They said, "We are an exclusive set; the common people do not want our principles, they are not fitted for them." And then came the great spirit of Christianity and swept that away. It was not for nothing that our Saviour was a carpenter's son—that the first great fishers of men left their nets to whiten by the sea of Galilee; and if we wish to be a great church, powerful for good, we must sweep all these philosophical differences away, in order that we may bring our religion home to the hearts of the people. And if we do so, we are but doing what other churches do. The Church of Rome has its Franciscans and others to go among the poor. The Church of England says that Oxford and Cambridge cannot supply sufficient workers, and founded St. Bees' and St. Aidan's for men to go among the people. So we are not to keep ourselves in isolation and proud self-satisfaction, which can end only in entire humiliation. I have now another word to say. What are the missionaries to teach? Some take up the Indifferentists' objection to this institution; they say, "Teach people merely to think for themselves, to be free," which is precisely what Mr. Holyoake and the Secularists teach. The young men whom we send out will teach the gospel that is to them Unitarianism. It is the gospel to them, because, on the one hand, it removes the clouds which have hung around our Heavenly Father's face, and shews our Lord as he really was; and, on the other, it prevents them from feeling ground down by mere resistless laws of Nature, without pity or sympathy for those who once have violated them. No great movement, continued Mr. Bright, had ever taken place among the masses, except by theology having been brought to bear upon them. It had been so in Luther's Reformation, and in the case of Christianity itself. The working classes of England could only be moved in this way. It could never be done by pet philanthropies, but in the manner in which John Wesley did it. It would never be done till the masses got true views of what their life is, and their heaven is to be. He wanted to see the religion of Channing brought home to the people with the power of John Wesley. I do believe, said he, that there is in our hands a movement that will alter the whole face of England, and bring together class and class in such

a way as had never been done since the first ages of Christianity. It will be so if we be only true to duty. Do any doubt this? Well, then, I say, I know of course that this *may* be all wrong; that all of us *may* be wrong—that we have been building upon hay and stubble and straw which *may* all be swept away—that the indifferentist objectors and the aristocratic objectors *may* be all right; but I care nothing for that. We have a course of duty before us, and whether we succeed or not, we can but perform that duty as God gives us strength to do it. There is a poem of Arthur Clough's; he is describing how the sceptical spirit comes to the hearts of men, and asks them what they know, and why they know, and what is the good of knowledge, and is it not all vain, and what will become of it; and as he speaks, the sensualist says, I know not, let me live my life; and the visionary says, I know not, let me dream my dream; and the philosopher says, I know not, let me think my thought;

"But when the rest were all o'erpast,

I know not, I will do my duty, said the last."

REV. CHARLES BEARD moved the first resolution, the appointment of the officers for the ensuing year. He said that although the list of names placed in his hands was a highly respectable one, it hardly furnished matter of a speech; while he felt that to sit down without further remark would not befit the occasion or be respectful to so important a meeting. The large number of lay names upon the list of officers reminded him of the missionary spirit developed lately in this province, and of the part which the laity had taken in the movement. If he asked, what was the missionary spirit, and what the conditions under which the missionary work could be rightly carried on, the answer to the questions might be larger than he could then give. Thus much he would say, that we were justified in preaching our truth only on the supposition that it was so dear to us, that we could not help preaching it, that it would be a dereliction of duty not to go forth and proclaim it. It would not do to seek to galvanize the half-dead body of a church by missionary effort,—to say that because Independent or Methodist were flourishing and missionary churches, we would adopt the same means to gain the same success. We were in a condition to make such effort only when we felt that the Holy Spirit had given us truth which it would be faithlessness to keep to ourselves. If this, then, were the true missionary spirit, the spirit which animated

the apostles, we should engage in the work personally, not by proxy. It was not for the laity to confine themselves to making subscriptions and electing missionaries. Could any one conceive of St. Paul giving only a pecuniary expression to his zeal for the propagation of the gospel? He (Mr. B.) knew that the claims of business were great, that men had their pet philanthropies and social agencies which might seem to them, and no doubt were, important; but if they properly felt the importance of religious truth, it would so possess their minds and fill their hearts that the claims of business and philanthropic schemes would fade away before it, and some little modicum of time, some small share of energy, would be given to the gospel work. It was of no use for the laymen to say to the ministers, "Go and do our work." Ministers had to do their own work and answer for their own opportunities. If, he continued, you are cold, can you expect that we should burn? If you are dull, listless and indifferent, do you expect us to be perpetual centres of light and heat? If we stand up year after year to preach truths before which all commercial relations and political affairs fade into nothingness, and those to whom we speak seem to take no heed to them, will not our zeal fade away? Mr. Beard concluded with a brief expression of dissent from some of the views of the preceding speaker.

Mr. ROBERT HEYWOOD seconded the motion, which was agreed to.

Rev. WM. GASKELL moved a vote of thanks to the Revs. H. Green and R. L. Carpenter for their services this year at the College examinations. No person but one who had filled such an office could have an adequate idea of the mental strain which it imposed. He had himself held such an office in connection with Manchester New College, and could say that if study was a weariness to the flesh, to examine the results of that study was a weariness also. The thanks of the Home Missionary Board were greatly due to the gentlemen who had undertaken those duties. There was nothing so much desired by Dr. Beard and himself as that the results of their teaching should be thoroughly tested, and he was convinced that Mr. Green and Mr. Carpenter would give a true account of the examination. Their work was not yet completed, it would take another day, but the examiners had given themselves to their duty with great zeal and earnestness; and Mr. Green had made a full report of each examination.

Rev. BROOKE HERFORD seconded the resolution, which was supported by Mr. AMUEL GREG, and carried unanimously.

Rev. R. L. CARPENTER and Rev. HENRY GREEN replied, each expressing his satisfaction at the results of the examinations.

After a short interval, during which refreshments were handed round, the MAYOR announced that as Treasurer he had just received £25,—£10 from the Chairman, £10 from Mr. Potter, and £5 from other gentlemen.

Rev. JOHN WRIGHT moved that we gratefully acknowledge our obligations to Rev. R. B. Aspland for his kindness in consenting to conduct the dedicatory service to-morrow evening. He was sorry that Mr. Aspland was prevented by a family bereavement from being present at this meeting. Mr. Aspland had been won as a friend of the institution by its success, and he was now willing to come from London to conduct the service which would usher the students to their labour of love. All, he was certain, would join with him in thanking Mr. Aspland for undertaking that office.

Mr. ROBERT TAYLOR HEAPE seconded the resolution, which was carried amid much applause.

Mr. R. M. SHIPMAN moved that the meeting, in taking leave of the students who have finished their course, wishes them success in their future labours.

Rev. JAMES DRUMMOND, B.A., said—I It is with peculiar pleasure that I rise to second this resolution. As I have just entered upon the ministerial career, I feel that I can the more readily enter into the spirit of the resolution. The best hope that can be formed for any man is that he may be useful. No matter what may be his department of life, it should surely be our first wish that he act his part faithfully. This naturally leads to the inquiry, what is it to be useful as a Christian minister? What peculiar form of activity is he called into? I conceive that the true function of the Christian preacher is to awaken the moral and spiritual life of his fellow-men. To this all else should be subordinate. It is not his province to advocate a dogma, however true. No man's life is effectually influenced merely through his intellect. In order to make any truth a vital power, we must enter into the heart and soul of that truth, and bring it home to the hearts of others. So long as we merely defend it by ingenious arguments and by refuting those opposed to it, it produces far more of the pride of knowledge than the humility of blindness and ignorance. Truth is infinitely great. The knowledge of it is so wonderful that we must advance to it through eternity. All our expressions for it now are poor and dim and cold. No doubt we have a certain

portion of truth, but it is only a certain portion, and the power with which we enforce it must depend on its power and vitality in our own lives. It is one thing to have strong intellectual convictions, and another thing to have a reverent belief in the heart. So long as belief is confined to the intellect alone, we must remain a lifeless body. I hope that this Home Missionary Board will awaken the sense of new duties among us. And I hope that those going forth will never forget that it is only when their hearts are filled with love, only as they enter into the difficulties of men, that they can hope to bring them to a more vital faith. Let it not be supposed that I am indifferent to doctrine. We wish that those who go forth may be able and accomplished expositors of religious doctrine. For religious doctrine has a practical as well as a religious side. It must be presented in a form that can be accepted by the intellect. But let us remember that our doctrine is temporary, that it is only partially true. We hope that the truth will receive always a higher embodiment; but it is essential to our religious life that we so set forth our opinions that they may be clearly apprehended by others. I am no advocate of sectarian action, if we mean by that only the destruction of the truths or half-truths held by others; but we are bound to give expression to our opinions when we see that others are suffering from theirs. We should then step in and clear away their doubts, and so give the spiritual power a fair chance of being brought to bear on their lives. Mr. Drummond then offered a few remarks on the measure of the minister's usefulness, and concluded by expressing the hope that those students who are now going forth will keep up their zeal—that they will go forth manfully to spread religious life around them—that they will ever possess a deep and thorough conviction that God is actually present in all hearts.

Mr. JAMES C. STREET replied on behalf of the students who were leaving the College. He gave an interesting sketch of his early religious history and of the circumstances which led to his connection with the Home Missionary Board, and then said—One effect produced upon us by our studies here has been to make us feel even less fitted to go forth and preach than when we came. We were then, perhaps, a little puffed up, but the result of our curriculum has been to shew us how vast is the field and how small are our powers, how mighty is the work and how weak are the workmen. For myself, I feel humbled to think of my incapacity for the high and honourable work to which I am called in this

city. I wish to go forth as a missionary—I wish to go forth as a minister; for I hold that every missionary is a minister, and that every minister ought to be a missionary. There is a field wide enough for all. No man can plead the excuse of want of opportunity. In the great sphere to which you have invited me in Manchester, I shall need the hearty sympathy and co-operation of my beloved tutors, and of all the earnest, true-hearted laymen of the district. There is a great work to be done, and your workman is very feeble. I am sure that I shall have that sympathy and co-operation, and therefore with a feeling of earnestness I trust to enter upon my work. The results I leave in the hands of God.

A vote of thanks to Mr. Lawrence for his conduct in the chair terminated the proceedings.

---

PROPOSED STATUE OF DR. PRIESTLEY AT OXFORD.

It is some few years since the University of Oxford with becoming liberality granted a sum of £30,000 for the erection of a new Museum. The building, now, we believe, hastening to its completion, if not actually finished, is in the Gothic style. Mr. Ruskin (no mean authority on such a subject) has publicly expressed his approbation of the style adopted. "The aim of the Gothic revivalists," he observes, "is to make art large and publicly beneficial, instead of small and privately engrossed or secluded; to make art fixed instead of portable, associated with local character and historical memory, and to make art expressive instead of curious, valuable for its suggestions and teachings, more than for the mode of its manufacture." The grant of the University was designed simply for the shell of the building. Little was provided in the sum voted, large as it necessarily was, for the ornament of the interior of the Museum. To improve the architectural effect, to make the building itself illustrative of Natural History, and to give to the Museum the most complete efficiency, it is proposed to appeal to individual and public generosity to make certain valuable additions. These include (1) shafts of different kinds of British rocks, useful and ornamental, selected in illustration of Geology. There are 124 of these, and each will cost about £5. (2) Capitols to the shafts and piers illustrating the natural history of various epochs, climates and regions. Of these there are 188, and the cost of this work will be £5 each. (3) Statues of the great founders and improvers of natural knowledge. Of the ancients, the selected names



are Euclid, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Aristotle, Hippocrates, Pliny; of the moderns, Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz, Oersted, Lavoisier, Linnæus, Cuvier, Harvey, Hunter, Sydenham, Watt. Of these statues, nine have been already promised, five of which (Bacon, Galileo, Newton, Leibnitz and Oersted) are to be the truly royal gift of Queen Victoria. But in addition to the names primarily adopted, others have been proposed and agreed to; viz., Black, Cavendish, Copernicus, Dalton, Davy, Decandolle, Franklin, Fresnel, Haller, Herschel, Huygens, Jenner, Jussieu, Kepler, Lagrange, Laplace, Morgagni, Priestley, Ray, Volta and Young. (4) Illustrative inscriptions to be worked by the architect into the mouldings or elsewhere.

This great scheme, worthy of the University of Oxford, is entrusted for its execution to a sub-delegacy, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Plumtre, Master of University College; Rev. Dr. Wellesley, Principal of New Inn Hall; Professor Philips and four other gentlemen of University standing and repute.

The admission of the name of Dr. Priestley among the "great founders and improvers of natural knowledge," has happily attracted the attention of some gentlemen alive to his great fame and anxious that every possible honour should be paid to his memory, and in various parts of the kingdom steps have been taken to fulfil this part of the noble design of Oxford delegates.

We have now the pleasure of mentioning that on Wednesday, Feb. 22, a meeting, convened by private circular, was held in the Library at Redcross Street (by permission of the trustees), for the purpose of taking steps to carry into effect the wish entertained in many quarters—that a statue of Priestley should be placed in the Oxford Museum. The large room of the Library was on this occasion adorned by a remarkable collection of portraits and other memorials of the great philosopher. There were the pictures by Opie, by Fuseli, Artauld and by Stewart, the striking medalion by Wedgwood, and two copies of the bust by Hollin. There were also many engraved portraits and printed memoirs of Priestley, covering a large table. Among the gentlemen attending the meeting were Thomas Graham, Esq., F.R.S., &c. &c., Master of the Mint, James Yates, Esq., J. A. Bostock, Esq., J. Ashton Yates, Esq., Rev. J. J. Tayler, T. P. Warren, Esq., Robert A. Wainwright, Esq., Rev. R. B. Aspland, &c. &c. The chair was taken by the Master of the Mint, who, after a few introductory words, called on Mr. Yates to explain the circumstances which had led to the meeting.

Mr. YATES tendered, in the first place, his thanks to the Chairman for his attendance and help. No one was better qualified to represent the interests of science in general, and chemistry in particular. The object for which they were assembled had the concurrent sympathy of others as well as of the eminent friends of science,—of many who regarded Priestley with veneration on account of the wonderful variety of his attainments as well as the virtues of his character. In the extent and variety of his works, Priestley is scarcely surpassed by any name in the history of literature. Many of his works possess extraordinary merit, such as his treatises on perspective, history, oratory and criticism.—The movement which they had met to advance originated with a gentleman of the west of England, Mr. Kent Kingdon, who, recently visiting Oxford, and passing through the new Museum, noticed the name of PRIESTLEY on the pedestal of a vacant niche destined for a statue. This led to his making inquiries on the subject, and finding what were the intentions and wishes of the sub-delegacy to whom the decoration of the Museum was entrusted, he entered into communication on the subject with Rev. Wm. Forster. That gentleman took up the subject with all the warmth of zeal, and issued a circular letter on the subject, addressed to and asking the help of all who revered the memory of Priestley. Mr. Forster had at an early period of his action enlisted his (Mr. Yates's) assistance. He had felt very happy to become the Treasurer of the required fund, and since that, all the subsequent action had devolved on him, and by him the meeting now assembled was convened. The proposal to erect a statue to Priestley had naturally interested many gentlemen at Birmingham, and especially Rev. Samuel Bache and Mr. Wm. Hawkes. The latter gentleman, a man of great public spirit and liberality, had taken up the subject very warmly, had collected subscriptions, and had with him (Mr. Yates) become a joint guarantee for the erection of the statue. He was happy to inform the meeting that he had received from Rev. Dr. Plumtre, on behalf of the sub-delegacy, an assurance that the statue of Priestley, if offered on the terms prescribed, would be gladly received and placed in the Museum. Mr. Yates then read a number of letters from Mr. Faraday, Dr. Plumtre, Mr. Roscoe, Mr. W. R. Wood and many other gentlemen, generally expressive of approbation of and interest in the intended work. He also read a long list of subscriptions.

Rev. J. J. TAYLER expressed the satisfaction which he felt in being able to take

part in a movement intended to do honour to a man so great and good as Dr. Priestley. Others would gladly have joined that meeting had the opportunity of doing so been given them. He might mention the name of his distinguished colleague, Mr. Martineau, who felt the greatest interest in the proposal, and who would have been with them had he received a summons. For his own part, however he might sympathize with many of Dr. Priestley's other opinions, he was willing to join in this as an expression of reverence for him as a great scientific discoverer. Had Priestley's religious opinions been totally different from what they actually were, he should have felt the greatest pleasure in supporting the proposal now before the meeting.

A long conversation then took place as to the best mode of carrying out the wishes of the meeting. The names of several sculptors were mentioned, and Mr. Stephens and Mr. Peter Slater, two sculptors present, at the request of Mr. Yates offered some observations. Eventually the following resolutions were drawn up and passed :

"That this meeting hears with satisfaction that the Delegacy of the Oxford Museum propose to adorn that building with the statues of the great founders and improvers of natural knowledge, and that amongst the names that of the illustrious Priestley, the father of Pneumatic Chemistry, is included. That in order to carry into effect the wise and liberal suggestion of the Oxford Delegacy, it is desirable that a subscription should be raised in order to procure a statue of Priestley.

"That a Committee be formed to carry this resolution into effect, and that the Committee consist of the following gentlemen, with power to add to their number : The Chairman of this meeting, Mr. James Yates, Mr. Kent Kingdon, Mr. Bostock, Mr. Joseph Parkes, Rev. W. Forster, Mr. E. W. Field, Mr. George Scharf, Rev. J. J. Tayler, Mr. Joseph Taylor.

"That the thanks of this meeting be given to the Trustees of Dr. Williams's Library for the use of the Library to-day, and for their promised use of portraits and models.

"That the thanks of this meeting be given to Robert Wainwright, Esq., the Committee of Manchester New College, Mrs. Bilborough, of Gildersome, Joseph Parkes, Esq., and Mr. Wm. Joseph Taylor, for the use of pictures, medallions and busts, exhibited this day.

"That the thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. James Yates for the steps he has kindly taken in calling and preparing this meeting."

The Chairman having left the chair, it

was taken by Mr. Yates, and it was resolved, "That the best thanks of the meeting be given to Mr. Graham for his kindness in taking the chair, and for the ability with which he has discharged its duties."

Mr. Yates (Lauderdale House, Highgate, London) will continue to discharge the duties of Treasurer, and J. A. Bostock, Esq. (54, Chester Square, S.W.), will act as Secretary of the Committee. We rejoice that this plan is now on the high road to what we doubt not will prove a satisfactory conclusion.

#### PARLIAMENT, EDUCATION, AND THE DISSENTERS.

There has been an interesting debate in each House of Parliament on the subject of education and the right of the children of Dissenters to partake freely of the benefits to be derived from the national educational establishments. In the Lower House, Mr. Pollard-Urquhart raised the subject by moving an Address to the Crown on the subject of the illiberal statutes prepared by the authorities of Trinity and St. John's College, Cambridge. The motion was not productive of any result beyond the utterance of several speeches, and especially one from Lord Stanley, which rather indicated that the spirit of Parliament was in advance of that of the University of Cambridge. It was argued that the powers of the University Commissioners were limited, and that the object sought by the motion of Mr. Pollard-Urquhart could only be attained by a modification by Parliament itself of the Act of Uniformity. When shall we have a Ministry and a Parliament willing to enter on this ground, so perilous to the interests of an Established Church? We may mention that in several cases petitions designed to support Mr. Pollard-Urquhart's motion were prepared, but, owing to the short notice given of the intended debate, were not forwarded in time.—In the Upper House, the subject of the admission of the children of Dissenters to public grammar-schools was discussed in relation to Lord Cranworth's Bill respecting Endowed Schools. We state the result and some judicious comments in the words of a recent number of the *Manchester Guardian* :

"The aim of Lord Cranworth's Endowed Schools Bill has been the promotion of a more liberal administration of the old educational foundations of this country; but, although the House of Lords has agreed to the clause by which the trustees of schools not founded for the peculiar benefit of the Church of England are required to

admit the children of Dissenters, it has condemned that other important clause, the object of which was to empower Dissenters to act as trustees of such schools. In fact, therefore, as it now stands, the Bill will do little to satisfy the demands of the Dissenters, whose children are already admitted into a large proportion of the principal existing schools, and are exempted from instruction in the Catechism and other formularies of the Establishment. It is to the House of Commons that Dissenters must look for the changes which we believe they have a right to demand. And not only the office of trustees, but also of masters, of the majority of our endowed schools, ought to be thrown more widely open. On this point we desire to draw attention to a suggestion that the graduates of London, Durham, and the Scotch and Irish Universities should be rendered eligible for appointment to master-ships in many cases where alumni of Oxford and Cambridge have hitherto been the only available candidates. It is but just that all our Universities should be placed on an equality in this matter, when it is remembered that in the majority of the cases in which the two older seats of learning are specified in foundation-deeds as the places whence masters are to be derived, the union with Scotland and Ireland had not taken place, and the Universities of London and of Durham had not been founded. Moreover, it was virtually promised to the London University, by the terms used at its foundation, that its graduates should be placed on an equality with those of the ancient Universities. We shall be glad to see some Liberal member of the House of Commons bring this matter under discussion in Parliament. Our endowed grammar-schools were founded, for the most part, either by Edward VI. of pious memory, or by persons who desired to forward the cause of learning at the dawn of the Reformation, in order that men might study the Scriptures for themselves in 'Ye Latin tongue.' Their aim was to further the cause of Protestant liberty, at a time when Protestantism was, so to speak, itself Dissent; and surely the spirit, if not the letter, of their origin demands perfect catholicity in their administration. The English grammar-schools, after long years, during which their endowments have been perverted and misappropriated, are now in process of revival throughout the country. May they all be restored to their true vocation, and may they be restored on a catholic basis, so that Dissenters, as well as members of the Church of England, may derive from them full and lasting advantages!"

## CHURCH-RATES.

The alarm and consequent organization of the Church party on this subject have produced a swarm of petitions to Parliament adverse to liberal legislation on it. Sir John Trelawny has carried the second reading of his Bill against a vigorous and united opposition. The Bill is not to go into Committee until March 28th. It is desirable that petitions should be immediately prepared and sent up by all who desire the entire abolition of Church-rates. The form of petition which follows is that recommended by the Liberation Society:

"To the [Right Honourable the Lords Spiritual and Temporal] or [the Honourable the Commons] of Great Britain and Ireland, in Parliament assembled.

"The humble Petition of the undersigned [as the case may be]—

"Sheweth,—That your Petitioners are informed that there is a Bill now before your [Right] Honourable House, by which it is proposed that Church-rates should be abolished.

"That your Petitioners are also informed that in stead thereof, and in opposition to said Bill, it has been proposed to exempt Dissenters from the payment of Church-rates, but to continue to force Episcopalians to pay for their own religious worship.

"Your Petitioners therefore beg most respectfully to inform your [Right] Honourable House that they desire no exemption from any duty properly incumbent on them as citizens, but they think that no citizen ought to be compelled by law to pay for any religious worship whatever.

"And they humbly pray your [Right] Honourable House to pass the Bill for abolishing Church-rates with as little delay as may be.

"And your Petitioners will ever pray, &c."

## BIRMINGHAM UNITARIAN BROTHERLY SOCIETY.

At the annual meeting of the above Society, held in the room at the back of the Old Meeting-house, Old Meeting Street, on Tuesday evening, February 14th, 1860, the following report was read by Mr. Reuben Edmunds:

The number of pupils in the Unitarian Sunday-schools in Birmingham at the present time, 1543. Course of instruction—reading, writing, arithmetic, religious culture, dictation, grammar and composition, imparted by 309 teachers; increase, 9. Volumes in Libraries, 10,438; increase, 231. Number of pupils depositing their savings with the schools, 727; increase, 140. Amount deposited, £439. 10s. 8d.;



increase, £77. 15s. 7d. during the past year. In connection with the Brotherly Society and Sunday-schools is the old-established Benefit Society, now in its sixty-second year, which, besides providing gratuitous surgical attendance, allows to those members who have been subscribers five years at 4d. per week the unprecedented sum of 18s. per week in case of illness. Number of subscribers to the Benefit So-

ciety, 498; increase, 5. Amount received by subscriptions to Benefit Society, £246. 10s. 6d.; increase, £15. 8s. 3d. Amount received by interest on capital, £266. 11s. 1d. Amount paid for surgical attendance, illness and deaths, £342. 1s. 5d., being an increase of £94. 8s. 7d. over 1858. Total capital of the Brotherly Benefit Society, £5998. 7s. 1d.; increase during the past year, £171. 0s. 2d.

## OBITUARY.

Jan. 30, in her 83rd year, Mrs. BISCHOFF, widow of the late James Bischoff, Esq., of Highbury Terrace.

Feb. 4, at Esthwaite How, near Windermere, in her 55th year, JANE, wife of Mr. T. Lindsey ASPLAND. To the memory of this estimable and gifted lady, a friend desires the opportunity of offering a brief tribute.

The characteristic of her mind and character was, that it was adjusted to the nicest moral balance. Gifted by nature with good sense, warm affections, and an equability and sweetness of temper seldom surpassed, she added to these natural characteristics truthfulness and a beautiful simplicity of manners. In the domestic circle her cheerfulness, friendly sympathy and ready kindness diffused constant sunshine around her. Her religious convictions were those of Unitarian Christianity, and they were such as accorded with and gave happy exercise to the natural convictions of her understanding and the affections of her heart. After her marriage, she, in conjunction with her husband, cultivated art as a profession, which she had previously regarded simply as an accomplishment. As an artist, her works reflected some of the qualities of her mental and moral constitution. She was a careful and discriminating observer of nature, and her pictures were beautifully truthful representations of what she saw. Her choice of subjects was largely influenced by her own bright and cheerful mind. Residing during the latter years of her life in the midst of the exquisite scenery of the English Lakes, her natural taste became more and more refined, and her practical skill as a painter was rapidly developed. Devoted to an art which she loved, and to the cultivation of which her peculiarly happy domestic relations and her place of residence were eminently favourable, her life glided on with as few drawbacks from happiness as ordinarily fall to the lot of human beings. About three years ago she was visited by severe

and sudden illness. Recently her friends were indulging the hope that she had rallied from its effects, when another attack, similar in kind but more severe in degree, after a few days of anxious struggle with disease, brought her life to a close. The cheerful and hospitable abode of Esthwaite How, which her virtues and talents had made attractive to many, and inexpressibly dear to the chosen companion of her life, is by this event made a place of unspeakable sorrow. Her departure is sincerely mourned, not by relatives only, but by many friends, and especially by humble neighbours who often needed her kind assistance, and seldom sought it in vain.

Feb. 8, at her residence, Flowery Field, Hyde, near Manchester, in her 74th year, HARRIOT, widow of the late Thomas ASHTON, Esq.

Mrs. Ashton was a native of the village of Mottram, about three miles from Hyde, and came to reside in the latter place at the time of her marriage, in the first years of the present century. The site of the flourishing town which now furnishes employment for nearly 20,000 inhabitants, was then occupied by no more than a few scattered houses, and the only centre of population was the village which clustered round the old Presbyterian meeting-house at Gee Cross. This great social change has been in great part owing to the commercial enterprize and ability of one or two families of worshipers at the last-named place, among whom the husband of the lady whose death we now record occupied, together with his brother, a prominent position. To speak of Mr. Thomas Ashton to those who are at all acquainted with the history of the cotton manufacture during the present century would be a superfluous task; it is sufficient here to say that he was unwearied in his efforts to promote the welfare both of his own work-people and of his native place at large. In all these labours he was greatly aided by the cheerful energy and unwearied benevolence of his wife. To her kindness it was impos-

sible for want or sickness to make a vain appeal. Her generous hospitality, which made her house a point of contact for social circles which might otherwise have remained apart, embraced the poor as well as the rich within its kindly sphere. She never forgot an old friend, even though she possessed a power, remarkable in one of her age, of making new ones. Her goodness was as thoughtful and unselfish as it was prompt; she said a kind word or did a liberal act with a delicacy and justness of feeling which made them doubly kind and liberal. Many of her charities are unknown except to the recipients of them, for she delighted "to do good by stealth." But the reckoning is laid up with God.

Of her domestic relations, of the singular success with which she discharged the duties of a wife and a mother, this is hardly the place to speak. The full beauty of the reality can be known only to those to whom these memorial words will throughout appear cold and indistinct, and whose sense of loss would be embittered by any intrusion into recesses sacred only to regretful love. During a fifteen years' widowhood, Mrs. Ashton's object in life seemed to be to fill as far as possible the place of a husband whom she held in deep and deserved respect. The extent to which she succeeded may be measured by the universal sorrow caused by her death. Her sympathies, active to the last, her lively interest in all matters of public and private import, her strong sense and practised judgment, gave her an influence rarely gained by one of her sex and age. She was as apt to engage the love of the young as to retain the respect of the old, and entered with unflinching ardour into the hopes and plans of those who were only upon the threshold of life. Among the friends who were admitted to her most unreserved confidence, and to whom her death is a heartfelt sorrow, are some who have known her only in the decline of life and are younger than her own children.

Mrs. Ashton was throughout her married life a regular attendant at Hyde cha-

pel, Gee Cross, and took the deepest interest in the prosperity of the congregation which assembles in that place. There she will be missed as one of a generation of sincere and consistent worshippers now almost passed away, and especially as a friend who never spared either personal or pecuniary effort for any good work. Once more, this is not the place to speak of the patience and Christian humility with which she bore a long and painful illness, one of the chief trials in connection with which was that she was debarred during many months from attendance upon public worship. She was quietly, almost unexpectedly, released from her sufferings on the morning of February 8th, and interred at Hyde chapel on the following Tuesday by the minister of the place. C.

Feb. 8, at the Parsonage, Cirencester, Rev. FREDERICK HORSFIELD. He had been minister at the Presbyterian chapel of Cirencester nearly forty years; but death, removals and other causes had reduced the congregation to the lowest possible ebb. What has taken place at Cirencester is a proof of the mischief that may result from a minister's being put into the list of trustees of the chapel at which he officiates.

Feb. 13, suddenly, aged 26, JOSEPH TUCKERMAN, second son of John FRANCIS, Esq., of Edgbaston, near Birmingham.

Feb. 14, aged 6 years, CHARLES, son of Benjamin HEAPE, Esq., of Polefield House, Prestwich, Manchester.

Feb. 16, at Bury St. Edmunds, in his 91st year, THOMAS ROBINSON, Esq., a magistrate for the county of Suffolk. His public services had for many years been lost to the community, the consequence of continued ill health, but they were respectfully remembered.

Feb. 17, at Newton Hall, near Leeds, FRANCES HANNAH, wife of Arthur LUTON, Esq.

---

## MARRIAGES.

Jan. 3, at the Unitarian church, Swansea, by Rev. Edward Higginson, Mr. WM. POWELL GLOVER to ELIZABETH, youngest daughter of John WILLIAMS, Esq., of the *Cambrian* newspaper.

Feb. 9, at the Unitarian church, Swansea, by Rev. Edw. Higginson, Mr. FRANK JOLLY, of Bath, to ANN FRANCES, second daughter of John WILLIAMS, Esq., of the *Cambrian* newspaper.

Feb. 14, at the Elder-Yard chapel, Chesterfield, GEORGE, eldest son of Mr. George BROOMHEAD, of the *Derbyshire Courier*, to MARY, eldest daughter of Mr. George NORTH, all of Chesterfield.

Feb. 19, at the Unitarian chapel, Swinton, by Rev. B. Glover, Mr. JAS. COLLIER to Miss SARAH ANN WORTHINGTON, and Mr. MILES BARKER to Miss MARGARET CROOK, all of Swinton.







DRAWN & ETCHED ON STEEL BY THE ARCHITECT.